DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 372 CE 001 209

AUTHOR	Prywes, Ruth W.
TITLE	A Study on the Development of a Non-Standard Work Day or Work Week for Woman.
INSTITUTION	Bryn Mawr Coll., Pa. Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Research and Development.
REPORT NO	DLMA-91-42-73-16-1
PUB DATE	26 Feb 74
NOTE	395p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va. 22151
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$18.60 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Economic Research; *Employer Attitudes; *Employment Patterns; Geographic Location; Heads of Households; Labor Legislation; Labor Unions; Literature Reviews; Manpower Utilization; *Part Time Jobs; *Social Factors; Unskilled Workers; Working Hours; *Working Women
IDENTIFIERS	Industry Size

ABSTRACT

This survey report contains findings on part-time work arrangements currently being offered by Greater Philadelphia Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) employers to minimally-skilled women workers. Employer willingness to extend nonstandard work arrangements and to establish the norm of steady employment in their establishments is reported. Employer opinions concerning business considerations involved in part-time hiring are reported. Attitudes of some SMSA union officials are also presented. SMSA employer attitudes concerning the social desirability of the employment of women who are heads-of-households is discussed as well as the social provisions currently being offered to facilitate employment. New legislation required to place part-time workers on a better footing economically is identified. Obstacles presented by Civil Service are reported on. A review of the literature on part-time employment is included. (Author)

ED 090372

A STUDY ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NON-STANDARD WORK DAY OR WEEK FOR WOMEN

This report was prepared for the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under research and development contract (grant) No. 91-42-73-16. Since grantees conducting research and development projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely, this report does not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Department of Labor. The grantee is solely responsible for the contents of this report.

Grantee: Dr. Bernard Ross
Bryn Mawr College Graduate
School of Social Work and
Social Research
Bryn Mawr, Pa. 19010

Project Director: Ruth Prywes

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE001209

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

1. Report No. DLMA-91-42-73-16-1

2.

3. Recipient's Accession No.

4. Title and Subtitle

Study on the Development of a Non-Standard Work Day or Work Week for Women

5. Report Date 2/26/74

6.

7. Author(s) Ruth W. Prywes

8. Performing Organization Rept. No.

9. Performing Organization Name and Address

Bryn Mawr College Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research
Bryn Mawr, Pa. 19010

10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.

11. Contract/Grant No. DL 91-42-73-16

12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address

U.S. Department of Labor
Manpower Administration
Office of Research and Development
1111 20th St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20210

13. Type of Report & Period Covered Final Report

14.

15. Supplementary Notes

16. Abstracts This survey report contains findings on part-time work arrangements currently being offered by Greater Philadelphia SMSA employers to minimally-skilled women workers. Employer willingness to extend non-standard work arrangements and to establish the norm of steady employment in their establishments is reported. Employer opinions concerning business considerations involved in part-time hiring are reported. Attitudes of some SMSA union officials are also presented.

SMSA employer attitudes concerning the social desirability of the employment of women who are heads-of-households is discussed as well as the social provisions currently being offered to facilitate employment. New legislation required to place part-time workers on a better footing economically is identified. Obstacles presented by Civil Service are reported upon. A review of the literature on part-time employment is included.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors

Employment, Females, Government Policies, Industrial management, Labor Unions, Manpower. Manpower Utilization, Questionnaires, Social Welfare, socio economic Status, Statistical analysis, Statistical samples, Supply (economics), Surveys, Unskilled Workers.

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

Part-time work, Short work-day, short work-week, short-shifts.

17c. COSATI Field/Group 5 I

18. Availability Statement Distribution is unlimited. Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Va. 22151.

19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED

20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED

21. No. of Pages 387

22. Price

FORM NTIS-35 (REV. 3-72) THIS FORM MAY BE REPRODUCED USCOMM-DC 14952-P72

PREFACE

Thanks are proferred to Dr. Merle Broberg whose invaluable guidance and assistance to all stages served to enable this project to advance from conception to conclusion. Thanks are also due Professors Delores Norton, Bernard Ross, and Milton Speizman for their help. Special thanks are also due Professor Ross, Dean of the Bryn Mawr College Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research for his encouragement and financial assistance.

Thanks are also due the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, for financial help which enabled the project to be concluded more speedily than otherwise possible.

Thanks are due to Professors Richard Leone, Samuel Klausner, and Ann Miller who offered invaluable advice and guidance. Thanks are also due to Dr. David Berger.

Thacher Longstreth, President of the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, was most helpful with advice as well as the use of his name in approaching the business community. Thanks are also due his assistant, Mrs. Faye Olivieri. Special thanks are owed Dr. Warren Lotz, Statistician, Philadelphia Bureau of Employment Security. Thanks are also proferred Mr. Ben Stahl of the Human Resources Development Institute AFL-CIO.

Sussel Katz is to be thanked for volunteering to translate from the Swedish. James Weisberg, Computer Operator, offered the best of service when needed. As always in a research project, the attractiveness of the final draft (and much more) is due to the dedication of the typist, Ms. Rosalyn Rubinstein.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET........................... iii

PREFACE.. iv

TABLE OF CONTENTS................................ v

LIST OF TABLES................................... viii

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION........................... 1

The Motivation for the Study................. 1
Introduction to the Subject.................. 25
Plan of Presentation of the Survey Report.... 36

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.............. 39

Theoretical.................................. 41
Surveys...................................... 45
General Commentary........................... 54
Summary...................................... 63

CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY.......................... 67

The Sample................................... 67
The Questionnaires........................... 76
Interviews................................... 77
The Statistical Analysis..................... 78
Collection of Background Data................ 80
Bias in the Survey Data...................... 81
Verification of Punching and Coding.......... 96
Computer Programs............................ 97
Appropriateness of Significance Tests........ 97

CHAPTER IV NON-STANDARD WORK PATTERNS............. 99

Non-Standard Work Arrangements in Usage...... 100
Abbreviated Shifts in Usage.................. 121
Possible Non-Standard Work Arrangements...... 140
Possible Abbreviated Shift Arrangements...... 148
Patterns of Non-Standard Work Arrangements; Employer Behavior Profile................. 163

Page

CHAPTER V STABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT.................. 115

Perceptions of Job Stability: The Availability of Steady Employment.......... 177
Employer Opinions of Labor Markets Favorable to Part-time Work................ 199
The Feasibility of Steady Part-time Employment in Respondents' Establishments........................... 210
Conclusions Regarding Stability of Part-time Employment...................... 220

CHAPTER VI EMPLOYERS' CONSIDERATIONS IN THE DECISIONS TO ENGAGE IN PART-TIME HIRING.......................... 225

Employer Advantages in Use of Part-time Workers.............................. 225
Problems in Personnel Administration........ 243
Unions as a Factor in the Decision to Hire.. 244

CHAPTER VII SOCIAL PROVISIONS..................... 267

Employers' Feelings of Responsibility....... 268
The Most Suitable Employer of Minimally-Skilled Women Workers who are Heads-of-Households............................ 271
Some Social Provisions Relevant to Female Employment.......................... 276
Adequacy of Labor Legislation............... 317

CHAPTER VIII PUBLIC SECTOR ISSUES: CIVIL SERVICE AND PARAPROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS...... 323

The Civil Service Issue in the Employment of Disadvantaged Groups.................. 323
Paraprofessional Programs as Potential Hirers................................. 337

CHAPTER IX FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS. 345

Findings.................................... 345
Conclusions: Implications for Social Policy...................................... 356
Recommendations............................. 359

Page

APPENDIX A

TABLE

1 Ranking of Greater Philadelphia Employers Reporting Recent Experience in Hiring Women Part-time Workers, by Industry.......... 362

2 Ranking of Greater Philadelphia SMSA Public Sector Employers Reporting Recent experience in Hiring Women Part-time Workers, by Type of Public Sector Employer............ 362

3 Rates of Reported Greater Philadelphia SMSA Employer Hiring of Part-time Women Workers by Size of Payroll, Private and Public Sectors.................. 363

4 Ranking of Greater Philadelphia SMSA Employer Hiring of Part-time Women Workers, by County.. 363

5 Rate of Urbanization of Greater Philadelphia SMSA Counties, by Rank......................... 364

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire on Part-time Work for Women, Private Sector......................... 365
Questionnaire on Part-time Work for Women, Public Sector.......................... 369
Cover Letter, Private Sector.................. 373
Cover Letter, Public Sector.................. 374
Reminder Post Card.......................... 375
Thank-you Post Card.......................... 375

BIBLIOGRAPHY.. 376

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE Page

1 Rate of Response of Industrial Categories...... 82

2 Rate of Response of Public Sector Employers.... 83

3 Rate of Response to Survey by County........... 86

4 Comparison of Number of Female Workers in SMSA, Per cent of Industry Female, Per cent of all Private Sector Female Employment in SMSA, and Percentages of Private Sector Questionnaire Response, by Industry.... 87

5 Comparison of Number of Female Workers in SMSA, Percentages of Public Sector Employment Female, and Percentage of Public Sector Questionnaire Response, by Public Sector Employer.................................. 92

6 Non-Standard Work Arrangements in Usage........ 103

7 Non-Standard Work Arrangements in Usage, by Type of Employer...............................105

8 Non-Standard Work Arrangements in Usage, by Type of Industry...............................107

9 Non-Standard Work Arrangements in Usage, by Public Sector Employer.........................110

10 Non-Standard Work Arrangements in Usage, by Size of Payroll, Private Sector................112

11 Non-Standard Work Arrangements in Usage, by Size of Payroll, Public Sector.................113

12 Non-Standard Work Arrangements in Usage, by County.......................................115

13 Abbreviated Shifts in Usage....................122

14 Abbreviated Shifts in Usage, by Type of Employer...................................123

TABLE Page

15 Abbreviated Shifts in Usage, by Type of Industry....125

16 Abbreviated Shifts in Usage, by Type of Public Sector Employer....129

17 Abbreviated Shifts in Usage, by Size of Payroll, Private Sector....134

18 Abbreviated Shifts in Usage, by Size of Payroll, Public Sector....135

19 Employers' Opinions on Possible Non-Standard Work Arrangements....142

20 Employers' Opinions on Possible Non-Standard Work Arrangements by Type of Employer....143

21 Employers' Opinions on Possible Non-Standard Work Arrangements, by Type of Industry....144

22 Employers' Opinions on Possible Non-Standard Work Arrangements by Public Sector Employer....145

23 Possible Abbreviated Shift Arrangements....148

24 Possible Abbreviated Shift Arrangements, by Type of Employer....152

25 Possible Abbreviated Shift Arrangements, by Type of Industry....154

26 Possible Abbreviated Shift Arrangements, by Type of Public Sector Employer....158

27 Employers' Opinions on Stability of Employment of their Part-time Women Workers, by Type of Employer....179

28 Employers' Perceptions of the Offering of Steady Employment, by Industry, and Industry Reportage of Extent of Part-time Hiring....182

29 Employers' Perceptions of the Offering of Steady Employment, by Public Sector Employer and Public Sector Reportage of Extent of Part-time Hiring....183

TABLE Page

30 Employers' Opinions on Stability of Employment of their Part-time Women Workers, by Size of Payroll, Private Sector....186

31 Employers' Opinions on Stability of Employment of their Part-time Women Workers, by Size of Payroll, Public Sector....187

32 Employers' Opinions on Stability of Employment of their Part-time Women Workers, by County....190

33 Employers' Opinions on Stability of Employment of their Part-time Women Workers, by Type of Industry....192

34 Employers' Opinions on Stability of Employment of their Part-time Women Workers, by Public Sector Employer....193

35 Employers' Opinions on the Type of Labor Market Favorable to a Part-time Work Force....200

36 Employers' Opinions on the Type of Labor Market Favorable to a Part-time Work Force, by Type of Employer....200

37 Employers' Opinions on the Type of Labor Market Favorable to a Part-time Work Force, by Type of Industry....202

38 Employers' Opinions on the Type of Labor Market Favorable to a Part-time Work Force, by Public Sector Employer....204

39 Employers' Opinions on the Type of Labor Market Favorable to a Part-time Work Force, by Size of Payroll, Private Sector....205

40 Employers' Opinions on the Type of Labor Market Favorable to a Part-time Work Force, by Size of Payroll, Public Sector....206

41 Employers' Opinions on the Type of Labor Market Favorable to a Part-time Work Force, by County....208

TABLE Page

42 Employers' Opinions on the Feasibility of Steady Part-time Employment, by Type of Industry........................... 211

43 Employers' Opinions on the Feasibility of Steady Part-time Employment, Private Sector, and Rate of Usage of Part-time Women Workers, Private Sector................ 212

44 Employers' Opinions on the Feasibility of Steady Part-time Employment, by Type of Public Sector Employer....................... 213

45 Employers' Opinions on the Feasibility of Steady Part-time Employment and Rate of Usage of Part-time Women Workers, Public Sector................................ 214

46 Employers' Opinions on Possible Non-Standard Work Arrangements Involving Stability of Employment, by Industry......... 215

47 Employers' Opinions on Possible Non-Standard Work Arrangements Involving Stability of Employment, by Public Sector Employer.............................. 216

48 Employers' Opinions on Possible Non-Standard Work Arrangements Regarding Stability of Employment, by Size of Payroll, Private Sector.......................217

49 Employers' Opinions on Possible Non-Standard Work Arrangements Regarding Stability of Employment, by Size of Payroll, Public Sector........................218

50 Employers' Opinions on the Feasibility of Possible Non-Standard Work Arrangement Involving Stability of Employment, by County..................................219

51 Employers' Considerations in the Decision to Hire a Part-time Work Force...............226

52 Further Employers' Considerations in the Decision to Hire a Part-time Work Force......226

TABLE | Page

53 Employers' Considerations in the Decision to Hire a Part-time Work Force, by Industry....228

54 Employers' Considerations in the Decision to Hire a Part-time Work Force, by Public Sector Employer....230

55 Employers' Considerations in the Decision to Hire a Part-time Work Force, by Size of Payroll, Private Sector....232

56 Employers' Considerations in the Decision to Hire a Part-time Work Force, by Size of Payroll, Public Sector....233

57 Further Employers' Considerations in the Decision to Hire a Part-time Work Force, by Type of Industry....237

58 Further Employers' Considerations in the Decision to Hire a Part-time Work Force, by Type of Public Sector Employer....238

59 Further Employers' Considerations in the Decision to Hire a Part-time Work Force, by Size of Payroll, Private Sector....239

60 Further Employers' Considerations in the Decision to Hire a Part-time Work Force, by Size of Payroll, Public Sector....240

61 Employers' Opinions on Personnel Difficulties Related to Part-time Employment, by Industry....245

62 Employers' Opinions on Personnel Difficulties Related to Part-time Employment, by Public Sector Employer....246

63 Unionized Employers' Opinions Regarding Union Attitudes Toward a Part-time Work Force....251

64 Affirmative Employer Opinions on the Social Desirability of Women Heads-of-Households Working, by Industry....270

TABLE Page

65 Employers' Opinions on the Most Suitable Employer of Minimally-Skilled Women who are Heads-of-Households.................... 271

66 Employers' Opinions on the Most Suitable Employer of Minimally-Skilled Women who are Heads-of-Households, by Type of Employer.................................... 272

67 Employers' Opinions on the Most Suitable Employer of Minimally-skilled Women who are Heads-of-Households, by Industry......... 274

68 Employers' Opinions on the Most Suitable Employer of Minimally-skilled Women who are Heads-of-Households, by Public Sector Employer.............................275

69 Employers' Reports on Sources of Training for Entry-Level Employment...................278

70 Employers' Reports on Sources of Training for Entry-Level Employment, by Type of Employer.....................................279

71 Employers' Reports on Sources of Training for Entry-Level Employment, by Type of Industry.....................................280

72 Employers' Reports on Sources of Training for Entry-Level Employment, by Type of Public Sector Employer......................281

73 Employers' Reports on Sources of Training for Entry-Level Employment, by Size of Payroll, Private Sector.......................283

74 Employers' Reports on Sources of Training for Entry-Level Employment, by Size of Payroll, Public Sector................................284

75 Employers' Reports on Sources of Training for Entry-Level Employment, by County.........285

76 Employers' Opinions on Availability of Public Transportation by Day, by Industry...........289

TABLE Page

77 Employers' Opinions on Availability of Public Transportation by Night, by Industry.................................... 290

78 Employers' Opinions on Availability of Public Transportation by Day, by Public Sector Employer........................ 291

79 Employers' Opinions on Availability of Public Transportation by Night, by Public Sector Employer........................ 292

80 Employers' Opinions on Availability of Public Transportation by Day, by Size of Payroll..................................... 294

81 Employers' Opinions on Availability of Public Transportation by Night, by Size of Payroll.................................. 295

82 Employers' Opinions on Availability of Public Transportation by Day, by County.......

83 Employers' Opinions on Availability of Public Transportation by Night, by County..... 299

84 Modes of Transportation of Women Workers, (16-44) in Greater Philadelphia SMSA..........304

85 Mean Earnings of Women Workers (16-44) in Greater Philadelphia SMSA, by Place of Work and Residence...........................306

86 Employers' Opinions on Suitable Sources of Day Care Provision.........................315

87 Employers' Opinions on Suitable Sources of Day Care Provision, by Type of Employer....315

88 Employers' Opinions, Public Sector, Civil Service as a Problem in the Hiring of Disadvantaged Workers.........................331

89 Employers' Opinions, Public Sector, on Problems Related to Civil Service in Hiring of Minimally-skilled Women Workers............333

TABLE | Page

90 Employers' Opinions, Public Sector, on Problems Related to Civil Service in Hiring of Minimally-skilled Women Workers, by Type of Public Sector Employer.................................... 335

91 Employers' Opinions, Public Sector, on Problems Related to Civil Service in Hiring of Minimally-skilled Women Workers, by Size of Payroll.................. 336

92 Employers' Opinions, Public Sector, on Non-Labor Market Factors Affecting Ability to Hire Minimally-skilled Women Workers....... 339

93 Employers' Opinions, Public Sector, on Non-Labor Market Factors Affecting Ability to Hire Minimally-skilled Women Workers, by Public Sector Employer............ 342

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Motivation for Study

Recent Approach to the Problem of Income for Disadvantaged Groups

This study has been motivated by the increasing attention placed on work involvement as a solution to the social problems of disadvantaged groups. Since World War II American planners and policy-makers have emphasized expansion of employment participation as opposed to improvement of welfare benefits as a means of solving our social problems. This trend began with the Employment Act of 1946 which declared as national policy that government use all practicable means to bring about "conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities . . . for those able, willing and seeking work." Practical implementation of this avowed goal began only in the 1960's when some of the excitement generated by fear of rapid automation induced Congress to enact a series of laws establishing manpower training programs, some of which were directed towards special groups considered to have limited employability e.g., youths, older men, welfare mothers. Women with minimal vocational skills and family responsibilities have, in the recent past, been considered unemployable and belonging in the home. Shrinking employment possibilities, because of changes in technology, have exacerbated the employment problems for this group of women. The black mother suffers an even higher unemployment rate than the white. When such women manage to find employment, it is generally believed that they do so because of the existence of an expanding employment market created by aggressive fiscal measures of the Federal Government rather than by specific programming for them.

Concurrent with the heightened interest in employment approaches to social problems has been the emergence of "income" approaches, the most prominent of which have been the Negative Income Tax proposal made by Milton Friedman,[1] the Children's Allowance Scheme, and the Family Assistance Plan proposed by President Nixon.[2] An approach suggested by the Webbs and revived by David Gil in the early 1970's[3] is that of paying mother's "wages," a universal scheme designed to place monetary value of motherhood. And a recent proposal by Benjamin Okner[4] has revived the idea of demogrants, flat payments to everyone in the population, which, if high enough, would eliminate many current welfare programs and serve certain other redistributive purposes as well.

Three recent "income""type proposals are noteworthy in that they are intrinsically tied to work and stand to emphasize benefits to those who work as opposed to programs which encourage reliance solely on dependency benefits. One is a proposal by Lekachman to develop a less repressive and more generous version of the Family Assistance Plan, approximating a true negative income tax.[1] Another, by Robert Haveman,[2] proposes that low-wage employment, public or private, coupled with earning subsidies and traditional welfare where necessary to maintain an adequate standard, be offered employable persons. Arnold Packer has proposed a variation of guaranteed public employment plus income transfers to families of various types and sizes related to various specific fractions of the median income.[3] Dr. Packer's plan contains a proposal of particular relevance to this study. He proposes that women with school-age children be given guarantees of half-time or full time employment rather than AFDC grants.

---

[1] Milton Friedman, Capitalism and Freedom. Chapter 12, "Elimination of Poverty," (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 190-193.

[2] The President's Message on Welfare Reform, August 11, 1969.

[3] David Gil, Unraveling Social Policy, (Cambridge: Shenkman), 1973.

[4] Okner's proposal is contained in U.S. Congress 93rd, Second Session, Joint Economic Committee, Sub-Committee on Fiscal Policy. Concepts in Welfare Program Design, Part I. (Paper No. 9, Studies in Public Welfare), 1973.

With this trend toward reconsideration of welfare policies born in the 1930's and their replacement by either "income" or combination "work-income" schemes, it is advisable to consider what recent experience has been in relation to the employment of welfare mothers and what efforts government has made to date to improve the earning power of women heads-of-households in relation to their meeting family needs. Since 1967 the concept of "workfare" versus "welfare" has been incorporated in the Social

---

[1] New York Times, December 2, 1973.

[2] Robert Haveman, in U.S. Congress, 93rd, Second Session, Joint Economic Committee, Sub-Committee on Fiscal Policy, Concepts in Welfare Program Design, Part I. (Paper No. 9, Studies in Public Welfare), 1973.

[3] Arnold Packer, in U.S. Congress, 93rd, Second Session, Joint Economic Committee, Sub-Committee on Fiscal Policy, Concepts in Welfare Program Design, Part I. (Paper No. 9, Studies in Public Welfare), 1973.

Security Act and was later strengthened through the Talmadge Amendments. While the general public is generally approving of this development and of the programs subsequently set up to implement the work provisions, professional observers have taken a more cautious position. Since this study has been motivated by interest in the possibility of developing part-time employment as a vehicle by which some form of work-income supplement scheme advantageous to women heads-of-households could be developed, a brief over-view of the conclusions of some recent governmental efforts to use the work approach in regard to women is in order.

Conclusions of Some Recent Literature on Work-Placement Programs for the Disadvantaged

The most important government efforts have been in development of the Work Incentive Program (WIN), the New Careers, paraprofessional approaches, and Public Service employment. The following is a brief summary of the conclusions of some significant WIN, New Careers, and Public Service jobs research which has bearing on the question of future public policy towards women heads-of-households, especially the welfare mother.

WIN Research

A purusal of the literature shows that researchers and critics are no longer resisting work requirements per se for welfare recipients, including mothers. There are widespread calls for a shift in emphasis from the supply factor in Manpower planning to the demand factor--that is, to develop programs which help employers change their hiring practices and policies. Numerous students have concluded that WIN and New Careers programs have failed to achieve their respective goals: (a) to enable the woman-worker to separate herself and family from AFDC through job placement and (b) to provide a large amount of career-ladder type of employment for disadvantaged persons in the Public Service area.[1]

Differing views have emerged as to the availability of employment for the AFDC mother and other minimally-skilled women. One widespread view is that there are not enough jobs.[2] Another is that jobs exist, but command wages which preclude women with families from achieving self-support even if employed. Differing views have emerged as to the amount of employment participation AFDC mothers are engaging in. Many welfare recipients are believed to be employed full or part-time but can not be frank about it. Some investigators are reporting that welfare mothers are work-oriented but unable to accept jobs for which they were trained because of the female wage-rate and the "taxation rate."[1] Thus a number of writers have concluded that greater inducements are needed within the present system to encourage women to work. Feldman and Feldman are dissenting voices in that they propound that present inducements to work are meaningful financially and need to be publicized so that women will realize it is to their benefit to work.[2]

---

[1] Leonard Hausman, Potential for Work Among Welfare Parents, Manpower Research Monograph No. 12, U.S. Department of Labor/Manpower Administration (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969). Edward Opton, Jr., Factors Associated with Employment Among Welfare Mothers (Berkeley: Wright Institute, 1971). Peter Doeringer, Penny Feldman, David Gordon, Michael Piore, and Michael Reich, Low-Income Labor Markets and Urban Manpower Programs--A Critical Assessment. Research and Development Findings, No. 12, U.S. Department of Labor/Manpower Administration (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972). Stephen Gold, "The Failure of the Work Incentive Program (WIN)" University of Pennsylvania Law Review, Vol. 119, No. 1 (January, 1971), pp. 112-128. Sar Levitan, "Manpower Programs under Republican Management," Poverty and Human Resources, Vol. 7, No. 2, (March-April, 1972). Analytic Systems, Inc., Analysis of WIN Program Termination Data (Fiscal Year 1970) May, 1971.

[2] Floyd Decker, Andrew Horgan III, and Lawrence Williams, Municipal Government Efforts to Provide Career Employment Opportunities for the Disadvantaged, (National League of Cities, Department of Urban Studies, December, 1969). Francine Sobey, The Nonprofessional Revolution in Mental Health (New York: Columbia Press, 1970). Jean Couturier, "Public Employment and the Disadvantaged-Promises or Program?" Personnel Report 701; Social Trends; Their Impact on the Public Service, pp. 19-28. Gaylord Nelson, "The Private Sector Simply Can't Do It All," American Federationist, Vol. 78, No. 8 (August, 1971), pp. 26-28.

As may be noted ffom the preceding no mention is made of the need for the mother in the home nor on the welfare of children. Rather, there is an emphasis on the larger issues of employment, such as the present wage structure which is seen as the factor responsible for the welfare "crisis," a situation seen as remaining the normal state of affairs. There is a call to recognize the increasing independence between welfare and work; that a pattern of work supplementing welfare may be developing. These writers and others ask for new policy instruments which will encourage women to work and yet accept that they must continue to be dependent upon welfare.[1]

---

[1] Samuel Klausner, The Work Incentive (WIN) Program: Making Adults Economically Independent, Vol. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1973). Leonard Hausman, "The Welfare Tax-Rate: Its Relationship to the Employability and Self-Supportability of AFDC Recipients." Transaction: Social Science and Modern Society, Vol. 6 (April, 1967), pp. 48-53. Opton, Op.Cit.

[2] Harold Feldman and Penny Feldman, A Study of the Effects on the Family due to the Employment of the Welfare Mother, Vol. 1, Findings and Implications, (Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, College of Home Ecology, January, 1972).

New Careers Literature

Most of the WIN research concludes that the primary problem impeding financial independence of these women who do obtain full time employment is the type of employment open to women. It is characterized as being primarily in the clerical, sales, or service areas; in jobs which are sex-labeled; and concentrated in lower paying industries where the work is irregular and brief in duration. It was this paucity of attractive, stable employemnt for disadvantaged groups which prompted the development of the New Careers movement for which research findings are now coming in.

A review of the New Careers literature reveals that New Careers employment has not developed on the large scale hoped for; arbitrary limitation to the Human Services is one factor. According to a specialist on legislation, the legislative base for New Careers programs widened during the late 1960's and early 1970's, but the funding was often diverted. Most New Careers jobs which were developed were innovative positions requiring continued Federal funding to support and expand. Little job redesign has occurred, a development which might have integrated New Careerists into traditional public employment. Civil Service and union problems require attention, but are not seen as unsurmountable. Administrative rather than legislative changes can suffice. The biggest problem in placing New Careerists in Public Service employment is the lack of appropriate entry-level jobs.[1]

---

[1] Feldman and Feldman, Op. Cit., Klausner, Op. Cit. Leonard Goodwin, "On Making Social Research Relevant to Public Policy and National Problem Solving," American Psychologist, Vol. 26, No. 5 (May, 1971), pp. 431-442. Michael Piore, "Income Maintenance and Labor Market Entry: The FAP Proposal and the AFDC Experience," Poverty and Human Resources, Vol. 5, No. 3 (May-June, 1970), pp. 15-22. Martin Rein, "Work Incentive and Welfare Reform." Urban and Social Change Review, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Spring, 1972), pp. 54-58. Sidney E. Bernard, "The Nixon Family Assistance Plan, How It Will Fail and Why I Support It," Poverty and Human Resources, Vol. 5, No. 5 (September-October, 1970), pp. 5-13. Martin Lowenthal, "Work for Welfare Clients, a Non-reform," Urban and Social Change Review, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Spring, 1972), pp. 58-63. Barry Bluestone, "The Welfare Crisis: No Exit," Urban and Social Change Review, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Spring, 1972), pp. 63-66. Auerbach Corporation, Evaluation of Work Incentive Programs (WIN)(Philadelphia, Pa., Department of Labor and Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Contract #53-40-50-01, 1969).

While New Careers literature emphasizes upward mobility, it is recognized that the concept of career-ladders is not appropriate for every group. Furthermore Public Service agencies tend to hire the best qualified persons despite alleged commitment to non-competetive hiring of the disadvantaged. Need has been confused with demand. New Careers programs require new Manpower programs directed toward occupational, industrial, and geographical sections of the labor market.[2]

---

[1] Decker, Op. Cit. Russell Nixon, Legislative Dimensions of the New Careers Program: 1970 (New York: Center for Social Policy and Program Development, Graduate School of Social Work, New York University, 1970). Sobey, Op. Cit. Natalie Spinyarn, "The Multiple Pay Offs of Paraprofessionalism," City, Vol. 5, No. 4 (Summer, 1971), pp. 40-44. Jean Couturier, "Accommodating Merit Systems to Upgrading," in Conference on Upgrading and New Careers, sponsored by the National Manpower Policy Task Force, Washington, D.C., pp. 84-91 Michael Wilson, Job Development in the Public Service, (Washington, D.C.: Social Development Corporation, 1971).

[2] Sidney Fine, Guidelines for Employment of the Culturally Disadvantaged (Kalamazoo: Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1969).

The absorption of New Careerists into governmental employment has been disappointing. The low wage structure and lack of opportunity for regular municipal employees is seen as an important impediment to absorption of new groups to municipal payrolls. Furthermore municipal governments are not seen as likely to adopt New Careers programs as long as funds are controlled by Poverty Programs which are seen as having an anti-city hall bias.[1]

An implicit conclusion of the above is that New Careers-Public Service employment will always be controversial. The more successful it may become, the more competition will develop for inclusion; the more opposition from those left out; the more problems with regular government employees and their representatives.

In reviewing the conclusions of the available WIN and New Careers - Public Service employment research it appears unlikely that any one program can meet the employment needs of disadvantaged women who desire to work. A variety of possibilities for the different sub-groups within the AFDC population must be offered. Since only the rarest AFDC mother can leave the welfare rolls through full time employment there is a need to deal with the increasing interdependence between work and welfare, as Rein has pointed out. There is a consensus on the present value of economic incentives to work, but many studies tend to negate them. The most significant development is the new position which prominent commentators are taking--that work for its own sake early in a woman's career as a mother is desirable; that policies should be developed to make this possible. Opton and Jessie Bernard have introduced another argument for employment of young mothers--the evidence that the birth rate is affected by employment of the mother. The emphasis is now on work, not financial independence; self-esteem, not motherhood.

---

[1] Jeanne Barret, "Tipping the Economic Sea-saw: A New View of the Old Dilemma," Career Development, Vol. 1, No 2 (May, 1971) pp. 10-13. Decker, Op. Cit.

With the modest application of the above programs unable to significantly deal with the mass problem of employment for female household-heads, the question arises as to alternatives. In a recent study of AFDC eligibility, a report of the Joint Congressional Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy recently stated that 91% of all female headed families eligible for AFDC are now believed to be on the roles.[1] The interpretation put on this estimate by the author is that "female heads of households are choosing total dependence on AFDC rather than combining work and welfare, as was the intent of the work incentive legislation of the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act."

According to the Subcommittee report, although caseloads doubled between 1967 and 1970, there was no significant change in the proportion of welfare mothers who worked. This lays the question open as to why. One implication which is drawn by the report author is that women are "choosing" total dependency rather than combining welfare and work as the Social Security Amendments of 1967 intended. Another possibility is that the discentives to work are so great that women simply can not afford to do so. This conclusion is suggested by Klausner's recent findings in Camden, New Jersey, that working mothers tend to have less real income than totally dependent mothers.[2] Another possibility is that mothers are working, but not reporting because of the high "taxation" on earnings. Regardless of the explanation one chooses to accept, the data on AFDC increase tends to belie the widespread belief that welfare mothers are women with the same characteristics as other mothers except for lack of a source of support and that they tend to go to work as soon as the children reach school age.

---

[1] New York Times, November 4, 1973.

[2] Klausner, Op. Cit.

AFDC roles are affected by many changes taking place in society. One change is the increasing number of very young mothers on the roles due to the startling rise of illigitimacy (from 5% to 10% of all births from 1960 to 1968). This change has the effect of depressing the proportion of the AFDC population which can work. Further change could come as a result of social policy changes. Should more states emulate New York's example of transferring ill and physically handicapped mothers to Federal Social Security roles as disabled persons, the proportion of very young mothers in the aggregate AFDC roles will probably rise and make for a lower proportion of AFDC women immediately employable.[1] At the same time, with a higher proportion of younger women on the roles, more AFDC mothers will be potentially employable as employability is defined by law i.e., with children of school age. Furthermore experience has shown that many mothers with preschool children who are not legally required to work are highly motivated to do so. Yet, for the present, the best picture available shows that dependency has not been reduced, but rather greatly increased since the passage of the 1967 Social Security Amendments and the Talmadge Amendments mandating employment for AFDC mothers with children over six.

---

[1] New York Times, November 18, 1973.

The Case for Part-time Employment as a Vehicle for Work-Income Arrangements for Women Heads-of-Households

If the current discussions of the interlocking of work-income and new, less-stigmatized sources of supplementary income are to be more than exercises in rhetoric, ways of producing suitable work situations will have to be developed. As the WIN program, for example, has shown all, the legal requirements, all the job training, all the attempts at subsidy are for nought if the jobs themselves cannot be produced and if women are not able to accept them. The position of this investigation is that part-time employment is a preferred form of employment for many women since it enables them to participate in the labor force while, at the same time, meeting family responsibilities. Implied in this statement is agreement with the judgment that work experience is desirable for its own sake; that experience has raised serious questions as to the wisdom of maintaining women in a state of complete dependency over prolonged periods of time.

Part-time employment is already a fact of life for 30% of the female work force, as of 1968. The largest proportion of part-time women workers, 35%, is among the group labeled "single." (This includes the youth sector which works part-time during student days). Thirty per cent of married women, husband present, work part-time while 22% of the group of greatest interest to this study, the "widowed, divorced, or separated, or husband absent for other reasons" are part-timers.[1] As will be developed later, it is believed that a very large proportion of women in the United States who presently work part-time do so for non-economic reasons i.e., because of family responsibilities, unavailability of day care for children, etc. While there is often the suspicion that part-time employment represents under-employment, for many women it appears to be the work arrangement of choice. Despite the increasing spread of part-time employment, recent articles appearing in popular journals report that responsible, attractive employment on such a basis is difficult to obtain. This is in line with the traditional view of part-time employment as being limited to less desirable job categories at the entry-level.

---

[1] Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics: Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 94, No. 2 (February, 1970).

If part-time work is to be studied as a possible work arrangement around which government policies in regard to work, welfare, manpower, and family policy might be integrated, more needs to be known about current practice in regard to non-standard work arrangements. Some of the important questions which need to be clarified involve the relative usage of such arrangements in the private and public sectors, the usage industry by industry, the importance of size of employer in determining the decision to take on a part-time work force, and the possible relevance of location on such decisions. Another important issue is stability of employment. If part-time work arrangements have expanded in recent years beyond the traditional areas of trade, clerical, and services, what does this new work offer in terms of continuity of employment? Do employers believe they can expand their present non-standard hiring practices? Do they believe it is socially desirable that women heads-of-households contribute to support of their families, and if so, what social provisions do employers see as necessary to make this possible?

The Greater Philadelphia SMSA

Before discussing the formal objectives, assumptions, and hypothesis of this study, description of the locale of the study is in order. The Greater Philadelphia Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area consists of the greater part of what is popularly termed "The Delaware Valley." The SMSA, the fourth largest in the nation, consists of two segments. The larger part includes the City-County of Philadelphia and its four suburban counties: Bucks, Chester, Delaware and Montgomery. The New Jersey portion, known as the Camden Labor Area" consists of Camden, Burlington, and Gloucester Counties. Camden County includes the City of Camden which, while a small city, is the hub of industrial activity for the New Jersey portion of the SMSA.

The total population of the Greater Philadelphia SMSA is 4,820, 915 persons, with a civilian labor force of 959,474, 13% of which worked less than 35 hours a week in 1969 when the last census was taken. At that time there were 78,883 female heads-of-households in the civilian labor force in the SMSA, 30% of whom worked less than 35 hours weekly, a figure identical with national averages reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as of 1968. When households in which women-heads with children under 18 were considered, again 30% were found to be working less than 35 hours weekly. When income was taken into consideration, the proportion of less-than full time workers rose sharply. Forty-three per cent of female heads-of-households in the civilian labor force who are below the poverty line were found to be working less than 35 hours weekly.

The problem with the above information, as with most data on part-time employment, is that it does not distinguish between volunatry and involuntary less-than-full time employment, nor does it indicate whether the individuals involved worked part-day or week throughout the year according to a predetermined arrangement, or whether casual, intermittent-type employment was involved. It does show, however, that the poorest women are far more likely to work less-than-full time than other women, which may or may not be the reason for their being below the poverty level. However, the mean earnings of all women workers in the SMSA are so low as to indicate that it would be very unusual for a woman with total responsibility for a family of more than one or two children to be able to support the family adequately. According to the 1970 census reports of women, 16 to 44, who live inside central-city areas in the Greater Philadelphia SMSA, the average mean earnings were only $3,856. The women in this age group who lived outside central city areas of the SMSA earned about $200 less per year.

How voluntary is part-time work status? According to Current Population Survey Data for the United States, far more non-agricultural part-time workers accept part-time status voluntarily than involuntarily. In 1972, for example, it was found that about 14 million workers were employed part-time for non-economic reasons, while 2.4 million were working less-than-full time because of such reasons as slack work, job starts and terminations, inability to find full time work, etc., reasons labeled "economic." Average hours of work were found to be 21.[1] Since so many of these workers are working part-time voluntarily, it may be assumed they are primarily women and youths. While these statistics are helpful in suggesting that many women in the Greater Philadelphia SMSA are working part-time by choice, this may be misleading, as one writer has pointed out, for many women may actually believe they are working part-time on a voluntary basis simply because the type of work they find is only available seasonally or intermittently.

---

[1] Deborah P. Klein, "Exploring the Adequacy of Employment," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 96, No. 10 (October, 1973), p. 5.

According to the 1970 Census, Philadelphia City-County contributes 81% of the employment to the SMSA, while the Camden Labor Area contributes a little less than 19%. Montgomery and Delaware Counties, the most industrialized in the Pennsylvania portion of the SMSA after Philadelphia, contribute 13.5% and 12.6%, respectively. while Bucks and Chester Counties, the most rural in the Pennsylvania portion, contribute 8.8% and 5.7%, respectively. Statistics for the Camden Labor Area, consisting of Camden County, highly urban, and Burlington and Gloucester in large part rural, are not obtainable by county.

Although the Greater Philadelphia SMSA is one of the largest and most industrially developed SMSA's in the country, it has great variation in its character. As noted above, the City-County of Philadelphia is entirely urban, some of the Pennsylvania and New Jersey counties have areas which are still largely rural in nature. The urbanization rates, as reported by the 1970 United States Census, are given below:

Philadelphia	100%	Burlington	81%
Delaware	97	Bucks	76
Camden	96	Gloucester	71
Montgomery	82	Chester	45

These ratings have not proved helpful in explaining employer differences by county, nor do they convey the fact that the characteristics of some of these counties are such as to seriously preclude employment for the non-mobile poor. Personal contacts with welfare, employment office, and WIN coordinators, two Pennsylvania counties and two New Jersey ones indicate that lack of transportation, often coupled with lack of employment in the environs, severely limits employability of persons without cars in these counties. Despite rapid development of some areas, many inhabitants are said to have to travel outside their own county to obtain work.

Both within the "hub" city of Philadelphia and in the suburban satellite counties, great changes have occurred during the recent past. Within the area the trend has been away from preeminence in manufacturing and toward white-collar, service occupations. According to material furnished by the Pennsylvania State Employment Service,[1] the number of employees in government, local, state, and federal, now exceeds the number of workers engaged in manufacture of non-durable goods. The two largest area employers are the City of Philadelphia, 35,000 workers, and the School District, 22,000. The two major universities have around 15,000 employees each. Employment in the service sector is up 95% in the last decade.

Concurrent with the loss of industrial employment in Philadelphia have come the burgeoning industrial parks in the suburban counties. There are almost as many manufacturing workers in the four Pennsylvania satellite counties as in the city today.[2] However, much more is occurring in these so-called "satellite" counties than movement, city-to-suburbs. According to reports, industry which has been long existent in the more developed counties is relocating. This is particularly true in Delaware

---

[1] Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, February 23, 1972.

[2] Report of the Delaware Valley Planning Commission reported in Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, November 8, 1973.

County where industry located near areas of intense habitation are relocating in remote industrial parks in undeveloped areas of the County.[1] This development has caused employment problems for the non-mobile poor who live in or around the old established centers. In Burlington, New Jersey, however, the industry moving into heretofore agricultural areas is more genuinely new and is bringing new work opportunities to inhabitants of the rural areas of the County. This new industrial expansion must, in large part, explain the extraordinary 44% population growth Burlington County has experienced in the last census decade.

The great changes occurring within the SMSA in regard to location of employment have a bearing on this study in that employment opportunities for the group of women under study are largely dependent upon the character and accessibility of work opportunities. In the decade 1960-1970, the Greater Philadelphia SMSA gained 11% in population, with the hub City-County experiencing a loss of 2.7%. The dramatic changes in the suburban counties occurred in those which were and are most rural. Bucks and Chester Counties, the most rural in the Pennsylvania portion of the SMSA, experienced 35% and 32% increases, respectively. In the Camden Labor Area, Gloucester County experienced a 28% increase. As mentioned above, Burlington County showed the most dramatic increase of all, 44%.[2] The implications of this great expansion in these still largely rural counties for women workers at the entry-level is discussed in a section on the relationship between work and transportation in Chapter V[illegible].

---

[1] John Bauer, Employment and Transportation in Delaware County, Delaware County Board of Assistance, mimeo, undated.

[2] U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of the Population: 1970. Characteristics of the Population.

Despite both the changing character of the Greater Philadelphia SMSA and the important redistribution of various types of employment within its borders, it remains an excellent area for study. For this SMSA remains one of the nation's most diversified and continues to represent, on a proportionate basis, 2½ per cent of the country's industrial categories.[1] The Greater Philadelphia area also includes a racial mix not untypical of many metropolitan areas which are struggling with employment opportunities for disadvantaged workers. Of the group of women workers of most interest to this study (women 16 to 44), 37% of the women workers living in central city areas in the SMSA are Negro.[2] The City-County of Philadelphia, the City of Camden, and portions of the suburban counties also have increasing numbers os Spanish speaking inhabitants.

The Objectives of the Study

The investigation aims to determine the practices, attitudes, and opinions of Greater Philadelphia employers in the private and public sectors regarding steady part-time work as an alternative to a standard work-day or work-week for some minimally-skilled women who are heads-of-households.

The assumptions and hypothesis of this study are in less than traditional form due to the lack of a knowledge base concerning the subject of the study. It is hoped that the information obtained in this survey will lay the groundwork for more complete theoretical formulation concerning part-time employment in the future.

---

[1] U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of the Population: 1970, Characteristics of the Population: Final Report, PC(1) D 32 New Jersey, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972).

[2] With the exception of steel production and ship-building.

The assumptions underlying this investigation are:

1) there is a need to develop new manpower programs directed toward the demand side of the labor market;
2) work experience for disadvantaged groups has value in and of itself and should be an objective of social policy;
3) attainment of employment status does not lead to economic independence for most AFDC mothers;
4) new social policies and innovations are needed to make work attractive even though financial independence can not be achieved;
5) benefits related to work and more respected statuses are more generous than benefits related to dependency status;
6) the low wage structure for peripheral work groups both depresses welfare grants and makes satisfactory implementation of New Careers and Public Service employment programs difficult;
7) a variety of work programs, work arrangements, and opportunities is needed to meet the employment needs of different populations within the AFDC rolls and the general female work force as well;
8) part-time work is often a preferred form for many women;
9) part-time work offers a woman the opportunity to obtain work status when she might otherwise not be able to seek employment;
10) part-time work tends to be irregular, seasonal related to peak hours in certain industries, and often is exploitive in nature; and,
11) the development of a non-standard work-day or work-week for some women workers has attractive elements in it for both planners and employers.

The investigator's hypotheses are that:

1) attitudes and practices of Greater Philadelphia employers are critically influenced by the type of industry involved, size of payroll, and

geographic location;

2) Greater Philadelphia employers who currently employ part-time female workers are in the clerical, sales and service fields;

3) industries who presently hire women part-time are those requiring peak-load coverage, are seasonal, or are considered to be marginal operations;

4) there is little interest among Greater Philadelphia employers for establishing a pattern of steady part-time work for minimally-skilled women;

5) union objections and demands making part-time employment financially disadvantageous are a major deterrent to establishment of a non-standard work-day or work-week in both private and public sectors;

6) most private employers are disinterested in government subsidies as an inducement to hire some women part-time;

7) small employers in the Greater Philadelphia SMSA presently use part-time help more often than large companies, but large companies are more willing to consider alternative hiring patterns;

8) employers in the private sector are more flexible in their willingness to consider hiring some women part-time than employers in the public sector;

9) employers in the public sector do not feel a social commitment to alter conventional hiring practices so that disadvantaged women might have some labor market participation on a part-time basis;

10) the possibilities of Public Service employment for women part-time is limited by the number and location of institutions capable of hiring women workers and by the paucity of units of municipal, county, state and federal Government able to absorb large numbers of personnel altogether and female personnel in particular; and,

11) if minimally-skilled women are to find steady part-time employment new kinds of requirements, inducements, schemes must be developed to make such employment a reality, in both segments of the labor market.

The investigator hopes to answer a number of specific questions:

1) Do employers see value to themselves in having women employees work steady non-standard hours or a part-time work-week?

2) What types of short-shifts are of interest?

3) What types of jobs are seen as best suited to short-shift work?

4) What might the benefits of short-shift work be to employers in relation to such issues as:

   (a) manpower shortages,
   b) better service to the public,
   c) increased strength in dealing with wage demands of the regular work force, and
   d) better use of available public transportation?

5) In what types of hiring situations are employers willing to consider hiring women on an abbreviated work-day or work-week?

6) What problems might be anticipated by employers in regard to personnel difficulties, union reactions, or Civil Service problems if a portion of the steady work force were to be hired on a part-time basis?

7) What specific provisions would be needed such as day care, skill training, government subsidies, or changes in current legislation? Who would provide additional services?

8) Are employers interested in hiring some of these women for their own companies?

9) Does the employer see social value in having women heads-of-households participate in the labor force, if only on a part-time basis?

10) How do the views of public sector employers compare with those of the private sector? Does public sector employment, county by county, seem likely to be available or feasible for the women in question in light of such factors as: presence of units of government capable of producing job openings; existence of public transportation, etc.?

Definition of Terms

The following definitions of terms are offered to avoid the lack of clarity and confusions which often result when terminology is not clearly specified:

Part-time employment: less than 35 hours per week, a standard definition for the United States. This definition does not differentiate between employment of a non-standard time arrangement which is regular and that which is intermittent in character. A part-time worker, as referred to in this study, may work less than usual hours by the day or week, temporarily or throughout the year, or may, on the other hand, work standard or non-standard hours seasonally or intermittently throughout the year. Peripheral worker: one who works less than the full year, a "behavioristic concept" developed by economist Dean Morse. Women are one of the discrete sub-groups considered to be peripheral workers. The term does not distinguish between those who work part-time voluntarily and those who can not find full time employment and for whom part-time work means under-employment.

Non-standard working hours during the day are sometimes referred to as part-day work or short-day. Work fewer-than-35 hours per week is sometimes referred to as a short work-week and sometimes as an abbreviated work-week.

Non-standard schedules are both referred to as abbreviated work schedules or abbreviated work arrangements.

Shift: a span of time worked each day other than the usual hours from morning to evening.

Employment which exists on a planned basis throughout the year is referred to as steady work, stable employment, or may be characterized as involving continuity of employment. Intermittent employment refers to work which is unplanned and unpredictable both in regard to availability and duration.

Minimally-skilled workers: workers with entry-level type skills. A low level of skill is assumed, even though a worker may be a stenographer, or key puncher, or a bookkeeper. The low level of skill, in such instances, may be because experience is limited or training very recent.

Because of the availability of payroll data by numbers of employees in the private sector, size of employer in this study has been measured by size of payroll. Size categories, based on grouped data, have been used, simply because some industrial directory data were available only in this form.

County of location: The county of the SMSA in which the company's or institution's physical facility is located. In few instances was it found that firms or institutions operated in more than one county. For reasons of computer technology, when this occurred, the employer was listed as being located in the least employment-contributive county of the SMSA which was involved.

As used in this study the private sector employer refers to employment offered by companies, corporations,or other types of institutions for the primary purpose of profit. The public sector employer is one who conducts operations either for purposes of government or public service. This includes such areas as public safety, recreation, health, education, and welfare. Purely arbitrarily, for want of a better term, employers who are affiliated with the federal, state, county or municipal government are referred to as employers in public administration. Employers in the public sector who are not formally affiliated with some level of government are arbitrarily referred to as public service employers. It is recognized that some hospitals which have been included in the public service group may be enterprenureal in nature; some may be part of a governmental structure i.e., a for-profit hospital or nursing home or a state or county hospital. Some educational institutions are primarily privately funded i.e., the University of Pennsylvania, yet are considered to be in the public service group. Many of the social agencies who have responded consider themselves "private, voluntary" institutions, but again, are considered to be in the public sector as the classification is used in this study. A number of governmental departments, those who perform service functions such as building, maintenance, recreation functions, health functions, etc., are included in the public administration group.

When part-time workers are said to be so employed for economic reasons, this refers to involuntary status as part-time workers for such reasons as slack work, material shortages, repairs to plant and equipment, job started or terminated during the week, and ability to find only part-time work. Non-economic reasons for part-time work status mainly refers to the lack of desire to work full time.

Introduction to the Subject
Part-time Employment of Minimally-Skilled Women Workers

The subject of part-time employment of women workers may be approached in several ways. There is a body of literature which reflects the changing attitudes of both women's groups and unions toward the phenomena since the turn of the century. This change from disapprobation to attempts to study the subject more open-mindedly as a phenomena which is increasingly spreading is developed in depth in Chapter II which is a review of the part-time work literature, a literature which relates almost exclusively to the problems of women workers. The part-time work literature, as such, does not deal with two closely related subjects which therefore shall be developed briefly here; namely, the long-time social concern around hours of work (usually the number worked) and the issue of timing of work performance i.e., shift arrangements, a subject on which remarkably little has been written.

While much social agitation has occurred over the years in relation to hours of work, the discussions of one period are often irrelevant to those of another since the length of the standard work-week has changed. What might have been considered part-time work in the 1890's may be considered a full work-week today, especially in the United States where part-time work is defined as employment any number of hours under 35 hours per week. Furthermore the arguments against such arrangements as night shifts for women which were considered an evil to be outlawed through governmental intervention (see Brandeis and Goldmarks landmark court case, Case Against Night Work for Women, 1915),[1] are considered by some as spurious in the 1970's. Protection is now seen by many women advocates as protection against better paying jobs. Again, while the general opinion still upholds Frankfurter's and Goldmark's argument that the shorter work-day leads to greater efficiency (Case for the Shorter Work Day, Supreme Court of the United States, 1915),[2] specific stipulations delimiting shifts which women may work have been seen as delimiting opportunity more than protecting.

Concerns Regarding Hours of Work

Interest in the limitation of hours which women could work has historically been related to two concerns: the desire to protect and the desire to spread work. At the turn of the present century an English author argued that both labor and management needed government intervention to limit hours since the force of competition was believed to force the acceptance of long hours.[1]

---

[1] Case Against Night Work for Women, Court of Appeals of State of New York, Louis D. Brandeis and Josephine Goldmark, (National Consumers League of New York, New York: April, 1914).

[2] Case of the Shorter Work Day, Supreme Court of the United States, Felix Frankfurter and Josephine Goldmark, (National Consumers League, New York, New York: 1915).

In the 1930's proposals were discussed before the Congress on behalf of a 30-hour week (6 hours, 5 days) for purposes of distributing both work and income, as well as to act as a pump-primer for a depression-ridden economy.[2]

Traditional union interest in the subject has related to reduction of hours of work of the work-day and the work-week. Union interest historically has been for more leisure time for purposes of improving health and family as well as for establishing job security for all by spreading employment. More recent union interest was focused on lowering the number of hours at which overtime rates become payable, so that a larger proportion of hours worked are at a higher rate. Thus the preference for increased income over increased leisure which has developed since World War II is believed to have had a significant impact on union attitudes toward the establishment of innovative-type shifts for would-be-part-time workers. By 1956 some unions were reported as having reduced the work week as low as 35 hours, which is just on the border line of the 1973 definition of part-time employment. While a 1957 union conference on hours of work took cognizance of the predilection for workers to moonlight in those cases where the standard work day had been reduced, no mention was made of the number of hours which prevailed in the second-job situations.[1]

---

[1] John Robertson, The Eight Hours Question (London: S. Sonnenschein and Co., Ltd. 1893).

[2] See Six Hour Day-Five Day Week, Hearings before the Committee on Labor, House of Representatives, 72nd Congress, Second Session, January 18-20, 1933. Proposal was backed by American Federation of Labor President Green. See refutation of concept by Harold G. Moulton and Maurice Leven of Brookings Institute in The Thirty Hour Week (Washington,D.C.:1935).

One recent proposal to establish a new type of working arrangement regarding number of hours worked represents an attempt to shift the burden of unemployment from the public to the shoulders of the unemployed. Benjamin Graham, an economist attached to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, in 1964 called for a "flexible work year" in which workers' hours would be reduced according to their increase in productivity.[2] The reward would be increased leisure. However, the objective is not leisure but the establishment of additional employment to be shared by those just entering the labor market and those who are unemployed. This essentially amounts to a scheme for new workers to share available new employment, perhaps dividing two jobs between three workers. Under this scheme employers and government would have to devise mechanisms for the job-sharing, while the new workers would be bearing the burdens of inadequate employment. This scheme for institutionalized part-time work for peripheral workers leaves to government management the specifications of non-standard work arrangements which might be utilized.

More recent literature describes the actual advent of a new arrangement of hours of work of the non-standard 40 hour work-week for purposes of business efficiency

---

[1] "Trade Union Conference on Shorter Hours of Work in the United States," International Labor Review, Vol. LXXV, No. 6 (June, 1957), pp. 554-565.

[2] Benjamin Graham, On the Flexible Work-year: An Answer to Unemployment, Occasional Paper on the Role of the Economic Order in the Free Society (Stanford Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Fund for the Republic, 1964).

(with a nod toward meaning for life style and preferences of employees). Poor, in 4 Days; 40 Hours,[1] reports having located more than 36 firms operating on the 4/40 basis and a few operating on a 3/36 hour basis, with more firms being heard from throughout the course of the four month inquiry which was conducted in 1970. Poor believes that indications are that the new 4-day/40-hour arrangements will spread and then shrink to 4-day/32-hour work-weeks. Such a development would represent the lengthening of the standard work-day for purposes of shortening length of work-week. A development shrinking the work-week to 32 hours would bring into being a situation which now would be defined as a part-time work situation i.e., any arrangement involving less-than-35-hours work per week. Since this 1970 publication, many newspaper stories have featured reports of firms on both 4/40 and 3/36 arrangements.

A major Philadelphia employer of women, ARA, a giant food service corporation, now has several operations on the 4/40 schedule. This firm confirmed, to the investigator, Poor's reports that, while some women with children initially leave facilities converting to this arrangement, the majority of women employers, after a trial period, prefer this arrangement to the conventional ones which previously existed.[2]

Poor and her colleagues found hospitals and health services to be engaged in some unique experiments with non-standard days and weeks. One work-week for part-time workers was found to consist of two 10-hour shifts and one 5-hour shift. Full time workers were found, in one instance, to be on duty 7 days in every 14 day cycle; 4 days one week and 3 days the following week, receiving 40 hours pay. Poor recommended that employers in other fields than health experiment with alternative type "weeks" for purposes of better staff utilization.[1]

---

[1] Riva Poor, ed., 4 Days, 40 Hours: Reporting a Revolution in Work and Leisure (Cambridge: Bursk and Poor Publishing Co., 1970).

[2] Poor, Op. Cit., p. 62.

Concerns Regarding Shift Work

It is a curious fact that little investigation has been done in the area of shift work despite its widespread manifestation in industrial society. In recent years two collections of papers have appeared which approach the question of hours of work from the viewpoint of shifts, "the working during some span of time each day other than the usual hours from morning to evening."[2] These researchers agree that, of the very small amount of research that has been done on the subject to date, most has been European in origin and has seldom been of a systematic nature.

Before discussing the direction of thinking on the subject of shift work, it is worth reviewing very briefly the history of social concern regarding non-standard working hours as they concern shift work. This review follows Mott's summary in Shift Work.[3]

---

[1] Poor, Op. Cit., p. 165.

[2] I am indebted for this definition to Floyd Mann as given in "Shift Work and the Shorter Work Week," in Dankert, Clyde, Floyd Mann, and Herbert Northrup, Hours of Work (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 113.

[3] Paul Mott, Floyd Mann, Quin McLoughlin, Donald Warwich, Shift Work,(Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965). Chapter 1, pp. 4-8. Mott's summary itself is based on the first chapter of a volume by B. Bjerner, A. Hold, and A. Swenson, Om Natt-Och Skifarbete (Stockholm: 1948).

Non-standard work hours, particularly those undertaken outside the regular work day, have been considered a social problem for a long period of time, especially in Europe. Possibly the first known expression of concern came from European guilds in the 13th century. Complaints at that time centered around the efficiency issue and resulted in the forbidding of night work. This belief is thought to have been generally accepted and to be responsible for the abolition of night work until the coming of the Industrial Revolution.

The appearance of factories in England with large amounts of expensive equipment provided the motivation for arranging additional work hours so that machinery could be more highly utilized. Human problems quickly arose and were acknowledged by the public through the introduction of social legislation to limit night work for youths (1802). By 1860 conditions of work in certain factories in England were found to be so shocking that Parliament created a governmental agency to regulate all aspects of work, including hours of employment. Other European countries took similar steps in the following years which resulted in the abolition of night work.

International recognition was given to the problem of shift work as early as 1884 when an International Labor Conference petitioned for international legislation against night work. A 1900 conference studied the specific difficulties related to the subject. In 1906 an International Association for Labor Protection was formed as the result of agitations produced by the fore-mentioned Conferences. This Association secured agreement from delegates of 13 attending nations on issues pertaining to night work, one agreement specifically prohibiting night work for women.

As Mott points out, these early moves against shift work were motivated by concerns about social costs to the worker while today, economic considerations have led to an ignoring of such questions. Both Mott and Mann in Shift Work[1] observe that, while shift work formerly involved primarily male blue-collar workers, today the rise of newer types of industry connected with data processing have introduced the practice in relation to white-collar workers. Since women are so prominently involved in this new type of employment, the problems of women on shifts represents a new situation for social consideration. Whether the shift worked is a "short" shift or a standard one, scholars have neglected the issue of non-standard work hours in the lives of women workers. Despite many references in the part-time work literature to what is clearly shift work, little data has been presented as to the specifics of such non-standard work arrangements.

Mott and his colleagues indicate that the major thrust of the study of shift work has centered around two major topics: (1) the effects of shift work on the worker--his physical health, his family relations and social participation; his attitudes and affective states and (2) on shift work in regard to industrial organization --the effect on productivity and on absences and turnover. Mott and colleagues in their studies, as described in Shift Work, have focused on the first topic--the effect of shift work on the worker and, second, on how environmental and personal factors interact to affect human behavior. This research was done through study of groups of male workers in continuous process industries in the east-central part of the United States who were related to the continuous process itself. Women workers, clericals, Negroes, and certain other workers were excluded.

---

[1] Mann, Op. Cit., p. 114

Because of the exclusion of women workers and female-dominated occupational groups, one of the very few existent studies of a systematic nature related to the American experience with shift work is therefore of little interest in considering the present or potential utilization of women in shift work. Furthermore Mott's study, while it devotes considerable attention to the relative desirability of various types of shifts in regard to each other and in relation to fixed-shift-versus-rotating-shift issues, does not investigate the prevalence of varying types of non-standard shifts or particular hours of shift usage. This is understandable since the study relates to white males who are least likely to be part of the peripheral work force. The exclusion of fields supplemental to the continuous process function has the effect of eliminating consideration of situations analagous to those often experienced in shift work operation by women workers. Mott and his colleagues, in their choice of continuous process industries as the exclusive object of study, have also excluded the newer type of operation which is frequently utilizing shift operations, the insurance companies, banks, public utilities, and governmental operations, all of whom use high cost electronic data processing equipment which is often utilized a second and third shift. Women are particularly important in such operations.

A further area of omission in the two works on shift work which have been cited is failure to specify the shift arrangements which are in usage. Mott's study limits itself to identifying varying shifts as "the morning shift, afternoon shift, and evening shift." Much of the discussion regarding shift usage focuses around the timing of lowest body temperature in relation to timing of shift work, since this has been identified in the literature as an efficiency issue. Again, little in this relates to the particular problems of timing to women who are mothers and homemakers during non-shift hour employment.

Possibly one of the most significant opinions expressed in the works cited on shift work is that many observers of the work force expect that normal hours of work in the United States will soon come to be six hours daily, a development which would have profound effects on shift operations. The liklihood would be that a fourth shift would be put into effect. All subsequent discussions of shift work thereafter would be related to responses and reactions of employers, workers, unions, and other interested parties to four new sets of working hours.

Finally, the question must be asked: Why has there been a relative lack of controversy in regard to the widespread existence of shift work? The following passage provides a convincing answer:

> The shift system is an inherent feature of modern industrial civilization. With greater mechanization and automation, with increases in capital/labor ratios and with rapid technical progress, the wealth of nations has come to depend on fuller and more rational utilization of modern industrial equipment to a degree undreamed of in the day of Adam Smith. Rather than representing a direct benefit or an advantage to our industrial civilization, the shift system is an inevitable economic necessity, and it would be naive to think that modern industry in any country . . . can operate on a rational basis with a single shift. In some industry continuous operation is necessary for technical reasons. In others a single shift, leaving expensive equipment idle most of the time, though technically possible, is unduly costly--a situation likely to become more and more common with increasing mechanization and automation. 'Man is learning to adapt himself to a scientific, rational, machine-based society'

and; the working of shifts is a part of this adaptation.[1]

A similarly pragmatic response may be given in answer to the seldom asked question: Why are hours of work no longer such a bone of contention in American life? The fight of workers today is for more overtime;[2] for more income derivable from second jobs. Actual hours of work are believed to differ greatly from the legal number provided for in wages-and-hours legislation. The answer is simply that workers, in fact, prefer income to leisure. The pressures inflicted upon workers by the prevalent high standard of living may offer little actual choice for those choosing to live as a part of the culture.

In similar vein, part-time employment for women is no longer controversial in the same sense as during earlier parts of this century. While some unions and some employers still forbid its use, world-wide the practice is spreading and is increasingly accepted because non-standard arrangements offer something both to employers in many industries and institutions and to would-be-women workers. Part-time employment has become so much an integral part of the modern economy that it is unassailable as such. Social interest groups are choosing rather to study and exploit the phenomenon. Women's groups representing middle class interests today are looking to expand rather than curtail the practice, though there is no evidence that such expansion would necessarily be beneficial to the great mass of women workers.

---

[1] "Towards an Optimum Pattern in Shift Work and Employment Expansion," International Labor Review, Vol. 98, No. 3 (September, 1968), p. 267.

[2] This statement is made despite the recent demand of Ford Motor Company workers for less compulsory overtime. Interviews conducted in the course of this inquiry showed great interest in overtime existent.

In conclusion, the subject of part-time employment involves a series of closely related issues: the status of women workers, the existence of non-standard hours of employment, and timing of such hours i.e., shift arrangements. The subject is less controversial than formerly because it is too much a part of the modern economy and meets too many needs of both supply and demand to be challangeable on social grounds. Remarkably little is known about the circumstances of such employment nor of employer attitudes in regard to it. This study seeks to increase the knowledge of the subject from the demand point of view. It is confined to examination of the part-time employment by Greater Philadelphia employers of minimally-skilled women who can work at or near the entry-level. It is also geared to inquiry concerning women part-time workers who are heads-of-households and presumably working part-time for non-economic reasons, chiefly, the demand of home responsibilities on time and energies.

Plan of Presentation of Survey Report

Following this introductory Chapter, Chapter II of this study offers a review of the rather limited literature on the subject of part-time employment, attempting to show how attitudes have changed as the practice has increased over the years. Chapter III is a presentation of the methodology used in preparation and execution of the survey. Chapters IV, V and VI present the major findings of the survey. Chapter IV offers the findings on the non-standard work arrangements in current usage in regard to short-day versus short-week arrangements, stability (steady versus intermittent), and extensiveness of job categories which are open to part-time women workers (some jobs versus all jobs). Also reported upon is the extent of usage of various short-shifts during day-time and night-time hours. Willingness on the part of employers to consider extending non-standard arrangements and expanding their usage of short shifts is presented, as well as an overview of Greater Philadelphia employer behavior in regard to patterns of usage of the non-standard work arrangements mentioned above, as well as the shift patterns being utilized. Chapter V discusses in detail the question of stability of part-time employment, how employers view the work they themselves are offering in regard to stability; what types of labor markets they view as suitable to the taking on a part-time work force, and third, whether they believe it is feasible in their own industries to establish a pattern of stable part-time employment for their women workers.

Chapter VI deals with business considerations involved in the employer decision to add part-time workers to his work complement. What are the contributions part-time workers can make? And what is the price to be paid for such a decision in terms of personnel administration? Furthermore, do unions in fact pose as severe obstacles as reported in the literature? If so, what are these problems?

Chapters VII and VIII report the minor findings of this survey. Chapter VII deals with various aspects of the social outlooks of SMSA employers in regard to the employment of women workers who are heads-of-households. A broad gamut of material is covered in this Chapter. First, employers' views on the social desirability of mothers of dependent children contributing to the support of their families through gainful employment is reported. Having established the level of support that employment of female heads-of-households evokes from area employers, employer opinions in regard to a series of social provisions which are often believed to be either necessary, or, at least desirable adjuncts of such employment is presented. Employers' views as to the necessity of job training for entry-level jobs is presented, as well as information as to the sources of training which are now being utilized. Public transportation as a factor in ability to accept employment in the parts of the SMSA outside the City of Philadelphia is explored.

In addition to survey data, supplementary material secured from county welfare and WIN program coordinators, the 1970 Census reports, and other sources is presented for the insights afforded. Employer views on day care as a necessary provision for working mothers to meet the expectations of a job are given, as well as employer views on preferable sources of such care if deemed necessary. Finally, the question of the need for changes in social legislation relating to Unemployment Compensation, pension benefits, and financial incentives if part-time employment is to be considered a desirable and sought after vehicle for the obtaining of work status for women heads-of-households is discussed.

Chapter VIII reports on the problems public sector employers see themselves having in regard to paraprofessional programs. It also reports on public sector employer views on problems involving Civil Service coverage in relation to minimally-skilled workers.

Chapter IX contains findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

A summary concludes sections of chapters in most instances.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature on part-time employment is a very limited one. It consists of one theoretically-oriented work, a handful of survey reports, and a few general articles describing or discussing the types of work in which women part-time workers are involved, their occupational and industrial location, on the one hand, and the social problems related to participation of mothers in the labor force, on the other.

For purposes of this inquiry the usefulness of much of the literature is limited by the fact of the preoccupation with the problems of the married woman worker. In this, the part-time work literature follows most discussions of female employment in focusing on the phenomenal rise in work force participation of married women. Until the very recent appearance of material dealing with the Work Incentive Program (WIN) which attempts to facilitate the employment of mothers of dependent children, almost no notice in the literature has been given to the special problems of female workers who are both mothers and heads-of-households.

All writers on the subject of part-time work agree that women workers comprise the largest segment of the part-time work force. Therefore almost all the writing on the subject discusses part-time employment in terms of its relevance to women workers. The other groups known to be part of the part-time work force--youths, sometimes the elderly or the disabled, are included--are disposed of in a few passages in most instances. The literature also agrees that part-time workers are to be found in the retail trade, clerical, and service sectors while largely absent from the manufacturing field. Agriculture, where it is considered relevant to the society, is also included.

Broadly speaking the part-time work literature deals with such issues as definition in relation to hours worked, explanations for the emergence of the phenomenon, the types of occupations where such arrangements are to be found, the possible advantages and disadvantages of such arrangements to both worker and employer, the social considerations involved. More specific issues such as the relative degree of absenteeism and turnover among part-time workers (as opposed to the regular work complement) are regularly commented upon. There is also discussion whether part-time work is voluntary in nature or involuntary, representing disguised unemployment, the consensus being that this issue usually needs to be examined in the light of particular circumstances. The earlier literature approaches the general topic more from the protective point of view--is it good or bad for married women with family responsibilities? Is it good or bad for the status of women workers? How does it affect upward mobility? The later literature attempts to present more organized data for purposes of better understanding and reaction to a phenomenon which is recognized to exist and to be increasing in our industrial society.

This chapter will first discuss the only known theoretical work on the subject of part-time employment; then go on to review the evolution of thinking on the subject as regards women workers through comment on the various survey reports, the American and the International, and, thirdly, will comment on subject matter of the few other publications which have been located. A summary will conclude the chapter.

Theoretical

The only theoretical approach to the subject of part-time work is economist Dean Morse's 1969 work, Theory of the Peripheral Worker,[1] which presents and interprets data on both part-time and intermittent workers as obtained from yearly surveys of work experience prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Morse's interpretation is attempted through a review of past and present labor force experience, as seen from the eyes of the historian, sociologist, and economist. Essentially Morse has attempted to develop a series of theoretical propositions about part-time workers in the American labor force, past and present, which both explain the phonemenon of widespread less-than-full time employment and lead to policy formulations. He uses the term, "peripheral," to describe the heterogenous group of workers in the labor force who have held a job at some time during the preceding year, but who have worked less than full time throughout the entire twelve months. Thus he includes the intermittent worker (he who worked full time for a portion of the year) as well as those who worked part-time (less than 35 hours weekly). Partly because of limitations of data, both workers who voluntarily choose to be employed less than a full day, week, or year, are included, as well as those workers whose part-time or intermittent work status represents under-employment or unemployment.

Women, particularly married women, are one of the discrete sub-groups Morse includes in his analysis. He sees women as one of the low status groups which belong to the lower half of a bifurcated labor force, the groups who can not obtain entrance to the preferred jobs which are held by white males of prime age. While the so-called peripheral worker is disadvantaged because of the fact he or she can not obtain the desirable work in our society, merely on the basis of his social status--in the case of women, sex (sometimes also race, age), Morse poses the question as to whether certain advantages exist to peripherality. Namely, he postulates that peripheral employment permits stigmatized workers to work. Some, he believes, could not work full time--even if so permitted. The unattractive, low-paying jobs of the lower half of the labor market may offer some work experience as against none at all. The part-time aspects of some of this work may actually meet the peculiar needs of certain groups, namely women and students.

---

[1] Dean Morse, Theory of the Peripheral Worker, (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1969).

According to Morse's thesis, part-time work status--"peripherality," may be explained by the following concepts: social status, commitment to work, changing patterns of seasonality in employment, random fluctuations in firm or industry output, type of industrial organization. voluntary/involuntary nature of the part-time aspect of the employment, and the relative investment of human capital (i.e., job-specific training). Some of these concepts are more relevant than others to explanations of female peripherality.

Morse relates peripheral work status to social status through the following propositions: (1) that demographic groups in American society can be ranked by social status; (2) that occupations (and sometimes industries) can be ranked by status; and (3) that low-status occupations (and sometimes industries) are associated with demographic groups who have low status. Job status, Morse argues, is in part a function of the continuity of employment which is offered. Therefore the occupations and industries which have the least continuity of employment will hire from the demographic groups of least social status. Sex is among the attributes which confer low status in America.

Borrowing from Parsons and Smelser,[1] Morse sees the institution of the family and the educational process affecting readiness to participate fully in the labor market. Thus women, through the process of education, develop ambivalent attitudes toward work which make full work commitment a reflection on their femininity. This lack of full commitment has a different quality than the lack of full commitment of earlier immigrant groups who, in the past, may not have been ready to work on a modern industrial schedule.

The phenomenon of intermittent employment--full time work part of the year, Morse believes, may be chiefly explained by the seasonal nature of some industries. This may affect women workers who attach themselves to such industries as Food-processing. They may believe themselves to be voluntarily working part year, but may actually be doing so because it is the only work available.

The factor of relative investment in training is another variable which establishes certain occupations and industries as less-than-full time employers. Those employees in whom employers do not offer job-specific training have a weak tie to the employer who, in turn, has little investment to stimulate him to develop a more stable work situation. High wages will go, according to Morse's thesis, to workers whose employers invest in their training. Those workers will hold the steady jobs. The rest of the work force receive little or no training, and, in effect, pay for the random movements of demand by working for low wages when demand accelerates. This part of Morse's thesis is of some interest in regard to female employment since reports on the employment of women workers with family responsibilities characterize the employment obtained as being low-paying, menial in nature, and unpredictable in duration.

---

[1] Talcott Parsons and Neil Smelser, Economy and Society (New York: The Free Press, 1956), especially Chapter II on the process of work commitment.

Borrowing from Becker,[1] Morse sees women workers as one of the discrete sub-groups included in the concept of peripherality which may not be stigmatized by inclusion. Rather women workers may be seen as purchasers of special work schedules which represent their economic choice. Following this line of reasoning, the part-time woman worker may be exercising an option by allocating a given portion of her time to paid employment as opposed to other activities. She may be understood as making a choice by which hours worked, combined with a given wage rate, reaches the highest preference level available at prevailing wage-rates. By Becker's reasoning, women require some time for non-work activities which are not explainable as idle time. Instead, non-working time is seen as a resource to be used in combination with market goods to produce utility. Pursuing this approach, the prevalence of the part-time work force represents rational behavior related to women's dual role of worker and home maker.

Since women's tie to the labor market is affected by social attitudes which accept less than complete commitment, Morse believes that in regard to women, explanations of employment behavior which stem from the concept of work commitment are less persuasive than those hypotheses which may be related to Becker's time-allocation theory. To the extent that women's part-time and intermittant work patterns represent free economic choices, he feels that this group can be best fitted into Becker's theoretical framework though Becker did not explicitly deal with part-time and intermittent work.

---

[1] Gary Becker, "A Theory on the Allocation of Time," Economic Journal, Vol. LXXV, No. 299 (September, 1965), pp. 493-517.

Surveys

American Surveys

In 1958 Gertrude Bancroft of the U.S. Bureau of the Census devoted a chapter in her book, The American Labor Force: Its Growth and Changing Composition,[1] to a discussion of trends in the part-time labor force. Her data came from the 1940 and 1050 Census plus the Current Population Surveys since 1941. She noted that, only in 1956, did the Current Population Surveys include reasons for part-time participation. Reflecting the public attitude towards part-time employment, Bancroft expressed concern least the wage structure be depressed by the entry of married women seeking supplementary employment only; that the skills of the work force be diluted; that little incentive existed for employers to train such persons as had little work commitment. However, she devoted herself to noting the dimensions of this newly prominent work force and determining whether it was changing. She included as part-time workers all those workers who did not usually work or seek to work full time the year round.

Bancroft found that the 1955 part-time work force consisted of about 20 million workers, about 27 per cent of all workers, and that they worked primarily in industries with sharp seasonal demand with schedules not calling for full time workers, or where other characteristics made the work unattractive to full time workers. She believed that the evidence showed that large numbers of these workers were making a deliberate choice to work part-time. While the 1940 Census showed much involuntary part-time work, by the 1950's the employment picture was so much improved that choice became possible.

---

[1] Gertrude Bancroft, "Trends in the Part-time Labor Force," The American Labor Force; its Growth and Composition, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958), pp. 88-107.

Regarding females, Bancroft found that there was a great increase in the number and proportion of female part-timers who were teen-age girls and women, 65 and over, from 1940 to 1950. However, of that group which includes mothers with home responsibilities, 20-64, the proportions remained about the same. She believed that the underemployed white woman of the 1940's had been replaced by the voluntary woman part-time worker of the 1950's. Among Negro women the increase was interpreted as meaning that more Negro women were withdrawing from full time work and opting for something less, while still maintaining a labor market presence.

The differences in industrial distribution bears out the above thesis. In 1940 the big employers of part-timers were the same industries which had high unemployment rates, Manufacturing and the extractive industries. By the 1950's the chief employers of part-timers were found to be the Services and Trade industries which then had low unemployment rates. Here many women found their part-time jobs. In terms of work patterns, it was found that women tended to work regular part-time jobs and not intermittently. Bancroft concluded that the part-time labor force was largely utilized to fill low level, low status, low wage positions, and that part-time work for women had little to offer the educated woman who was looking for more than income.

A 1960 United States Department of Labor/Women's Bureau Survey[1] represents the first full scale American study on the subject. The approach was an empirical one, treating the subject as a permanent aspect of the labor force scene. Reporting that more women were working than ever before, both proportionally as well in absolute numbers, the Women's Bureau statisticians predicted that part-time employment would rise during the 1970's, but were unsure as to how possible societal changes in practices and preferences (examples: duration of school attendance, preference changes for full time work over part-time) might affect future rates for part-time work.

---

[1] Part-time Work for Women, U.S. Department of Labor/ Women's Bureau, Bulletin #238, (Washington, D.C.: 1960).

This survey produced data regarding the size and relative importance of the part-time work force; the characteristics of women part-time workers (age, marital status, age of children, and regional distribution); the reasons why women work part-time; and the industrial and occupational distribution of part-time jobs.

This survey report stated that the number of part-time workers was increasing on a proportionate basis far more than full time workers. About a third of the nine million part-time workers were year-round workers. Typically the woman part-time worker was found to be married, between 35 and 44, and employed in the Service category rather than Manufacturing. The older age groups beyond 44 showed a very large increase in numbers, suggesting that, in large part, the phenomenon of part-time work may be viewed as a re-entry vehicle. Women whose children are growing up may be viewed as seeking return to the labor force through part-time work arrangements. The data on age of children tended to show that the older the children, the more the mother worked, whether full or part-time and that women with no children under 18 tended to work full time more often than women with children under this age. The regional distribution of part-time employment tended to confirm that, where Manufacturing offers the most employment opportunities (the north-eastern region), part-time work is less prevalent.

This report, using March 1959 data, stated that the great majority of women who worked part-time did so for non-economic reasons; that is, the demands of home, of school or lack of desire for full time work, rather than availability of work determining the fact of the part-time status. However, in Manufacturing, as opposed to other occupational areas, few regular part-time jobs were available to women. Many of the women working part-time in this area were, in fact, underemployed, full time employment not existing. In general the great majority of part-time women workers in the non-agricultural sectors were found to be in the Services or Trade.

While part-time employment was seen as being chosen for "non-economic" reasons in labor-market terms, the motivation was presented here as being financial rewards, an emphasis which was to change over the next decade.

Except for this 1960 survey report the remaining major survey reports on the part-time work[1] are International in origin and, in fact, European centered. One possible explanation is that part-time work has been seen as a social problem by some in Europe whereas this has not occurred in the United States.

International Surveys

The following review of the most important International surveys on part-time employment is useful for purposes of orientation. Since the early 1950's the multi-national Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development has produced the most comprehensive material which has been done on the subject. Although references may be found which indicate interest in the topic in Depression-ridden Europe of the 1930's, the literature of most interest stems from the conditions encountered in the 1950's. Not surprisingly this is the post-World War II period when the problem of part-time work became related to manpower shortages experienced in Europe in the post-War recovery period which has lasted to this day.

---

[1] An exception is a report on part-time work opportunities for professional women, published by Kelly Associates, no date.

In 1952 the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report . . .

> containing information to be obtained from non-governmental sources and other dependable sources concerning the use of part-time schedules by men and women workers, particularly women workers with responsibility for families and children, and the areas where part-time work is of particular significance.[1]

The ILO was asked to make a study, contacted various International women's groups, unions, employer associations, and other organizations in 12 countries, 17 replies being received from nations in Europe, Africa, North America, as well as Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines. Thus the material received represented extremely disparate experiences in societies at different stages of development.

This early report emphasizes the importance of differentiating voluntary part-time work from casual or seasonal work; pointed out the close relationship between the incidence of part-time work and the economic conditions prevailing in a country (the degree of industrialization, the labor supply, and the adequacy of family income to meet needs); and pointed out that the benefits were a critical issue in the whole part-time work question. It was also pointed out that statistics were either non-existent or extremely limited. Considerable concern was expressed by some respondents that efforts to deal with the new circumstances of part-time employment for women might have deleterious effects on the status of female employment, possibly by excluding women from full time work or "protecting" women by depriving them of opportunities for this work arrangement altogether.

---

[1] This report was published in two forms by the United Nations. The fuller survey results are contained in the United Nations Economic and Social Council. Commission on Status of Women, Seventh Session, "Part-time Employment, Preliminary Report,"(12 February, 1953).

The second ILO survey, made in 1962[1] was broader in scope and produced responses from ILO women's consultants, branch offices, and International non-governmental organizations in 50 countries. The 1963 report of this survey dealt with the prevalence of such employment in the various countries, presenting the ways in which such work was organized (numbers of hours worked and distribution; stability of employment, the characteristics of the labor force involved); and the conditions of employment in relation to benefits, security, and upward mobility. It put particular emphasis on the question of social security benefits and considered the reasons for the appearance of part-time work in terms of supply and demand, also the attitudes of both employers and workers in regard to this form of employment. Again, dissatisfaction was expressed with the inadequacies of the material presented.

In comparison with the 1952 report, contributors believed that there was, in 1963, a . . .

---

[1] "An International Survey of Part-time Employment," Parts I and II International Labor Review, Volume XXXVIII, Nos. 4 and 5 (October and November 1963), pp. 380-407, 490-517.

> wider, though still reluctant, acceptance of the fact that part-time employment has come to stay and that employers and indeed all others concerned--must therefore prepare to make the best of it.[1]

Mention was made that part-time employment fills a real need in certain industries and occupations. The successful experience in many countries with part-time employment as the result of continuing labor shortages, combined with pressures of social technological change, was seen as explanatory of the increased acceptance of this form of employment. Attention was also drawn to the importance of providing an opportunity for the part-time worker to participate in the world of work as well as the fact that such workers make contributions to society which might otherwise be lost.

The need for further action-oriented study was seen as it was felt many practical problems needed to be identified and confronted. Meanwhile the important development of the widespread acceptance of the shorter working day and week was noted, with the acknowledgment that no one could know what impact this might have on the phenomenon of part-time work.

The 1968 study of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, a largely European organization,[2] with expertise in manpower problems of "special groups," approached the subject of part-time work as a form of employment which "has come to stay,"[3] but which has not yet been established on a normal basis. Existing regulations and collective agreements are seen as being related only to "normal" employment. The objective of this OECD investigation was to "attempt a synthesis of efforts made so far" to modify and adjust existing arrangements and agreements and "to try to establish a basis for a proper policy concerning part-time employment."[1] The author did not attempt to gather a large body of new data, but extensively contacted governmental agencies, unions, employers, and social scientists interested in employment problems in European countries to "compare theoretical positions with actual situations, and attempt to distinguish, amid a welter of arguments for and against part-time jobs, between genuine and illusionary problems,"

---

[1] An International Survey of Part-time Employment: II, Op. Cit., p. 507.

[2] United States, Canada, Turkey, Iceland, and Japan also belong to the 21 nation group which was organized in 1960 to promote policies directed towards achieving highest level of sound economic growth and other related goals.

[3] France, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

While the outline of Hallaire's small book is very similar to that of the brief 1952 ILO study, the purpose is more sharply focused; the investigation covers only a few countries, but ones with more similar circumstances of economic development; also systematic presentation is given of the major employer, union, and benefit-related problems which Hallaire identifies as being relevant to the subject of part-time work. Hallaire's avowed goal in his use of his material is to "promote a more conscious policy which would allow employers to make the best use of this group of employees and to remove prevailing discrimination" against the part-time work force.[2]

Hallaire calls for the establishment of statistics as a first necessity in the development of a positive manpower policy in relation to part-time work. Then, "information on current experience and arrangements, the effect of the various deterrents, the alternatives which might be considered, and their likely influence on behavior."[1] He recommends that national studies be made to determine the facts of part-time work for each country. While many of the important contributions of Hallaire's report are not especially applicable to the American scene because the tax and social security benefit policies are not analagous, he presents both detailed framework for future analysis which are relevant and enough specific factual material for comparisons to be made.

---

[1] Jean Hallaire, Part-time Employment: Its Extent and its Problems (Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1968), p. 14.

[2] Hallaire, Op. Cit., p. 10.

In 1973, noting the more positive attitudes toward part-time work which have developed since the 1963 ILO report, the ILO published a report, "Part-time Work in the Public Service,"[2] the results of a survey of the practices of 10 European countries and the United States in regard to Public Sector, especially governmental employment. This report noted that very few countries had adopted special legislation covering part-time employment in the public service; that piecemeal measures exist where any at all, these provisions often placing the part-time worker in a less advantaged position.

This study reviews the conditions for part-time work in the nations studied; the comparative rights of part-time workers as per remuneration, advancement and promotion, leave, and pension rights; the characteristics of the part-time work force (chiefly women); the types of jobs filled; and the problems in organization of such non-standard work arrangements. It introduces the thought that while part-time work arrangements now are seen by governments as a means for accommodating . . .

---

[1] Hallaire, Op. Cit., p. 11.

[2] Marion Manjic, "Part-time Work in the Public Service," International Labor Review, Vol. 105, No. 2 (April 1972), pp. 335-349.

> strictly defined needs of various categories of workers prevented temporarily from working full time, they nevertheless acknowledge a form of employment which may well be used increasingly often in the future for quite different purposes and specially to satisfy the need for lifelong education.[1]

General Commentary

The existence of a pool of women and children as an alternative labor source has created anxieties since the early days of the Industrial Revolution. The 20th century upsurge in part-time work arrangements which primarily involve women and youths has revived these fears. Thus the early literature on part-time work, influenced by the demand factor of the times, looked on the subject fearfully. The Depression-era reference in "The Employment of Women and Children" in the LIO's The Law and Women's Work[2] expressed concern that regular (male) workers be displaced in slack periods by part-time (female) workers. Bancroft,[3] in 1958, began her chapter on part-time work with the conventional recounting of problems and difficulties involved. Bruntz,[4] in her article on "Part-time Employment of Women in Industrialized Countries," as late as 1962 devotes the early portion of her article to justifying a public policy of encouraging non-standard work arrangements on behalf of women. As the national economies involved became more prosperous, so has the literature become less defensive. In Europe, a near full employment situation has existed since World War II. The urgent need for manpower during World War II led to an abrupt change of attitude as the sudden appearance of official publications linking mothers to the war effort shows.

---

[1] Manjic, Op. Cit., pp. 335-7.

[2] International Labor Office, The Law and Women's Work, Studies and Reports, Series I, Employment of Women and Children, No. 4 (Geneva: 1939), p. 120.

[3] Bancroft, Op. Cit.

[4] Francois Bruntz, "The Part-time Employment of Women in the Industrialized Countries," International Labor Review, Vol. No. 5 (November 1962), pp. 425-442.

Official cognizance of such employment as a contribution to national well-being appeared during these years, both in Britain and the United States (Planning for Part-time Work,[1] a British Labor Ministry and National Service publication and Part-time Employment in War Time,[2] a United States Labor Department bulletin). The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics also reported on the British experience in the Monthly Labor Review[3] in 1942. In 1948 a sympathetic discussion of married women's difficulties in regard to reconciling their dual roles appeared in the British Journal, Industrial Welfare and Personnel Management.[4]

---

[1] United Kingdom, Ministry of Labour and National Service, Planning for Part-time Work (P.L. 105/1942).

[2] Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, Part-time Employment of Women in War Time, Special Bulletin No. 13, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1943).

[3] "Part-time Employment of Women in Great Britain," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 54, No. 5 (May 1942), pp. 1089-91.

[4] Mrs. Watson, "The Part-time Worker," Industrial Welfare and Personnel Management (May-June 1948), pp. 78-80, as cited in United Nations Economic and Social Council, Commission on the Status of Women, 7th Session, "Part-time Employment, Preliminary Report," (February 12, 1953), p.17.

In 1957 meeting of female employment experts from non-government groups also took an increasingly sympathetic view of the subject.[1] The report emphasizes economic necessity as the chief motivation for the interest of women in employment and was unusual in that a number of specific references identified women workers as often being heads-of-households. It also broke new ground in identifying the motivation to work as often that of bringing income up to a subsistence level (rather than picturing female wages as being "supplementary" with its different connotation). Recognizing that part-time work arrangements have not taken hold in the manufacturing industries, this report discussed the problems related to further extending such arrangements in this general area. The participants in this conference were not optimistic about such expansion and concluded that future expansion of part-time work arrangements was hopeful because of the ever increasing diversification of distributive and service trades and social services of all kinds typical of the modern industrial state.

This 1957 meeting discussed demographic aspects of the over-all labor force, pointing out that arguments have been advanced which stress the need of a part-time female work force to replace an increasingly aging work force. Some limited investigation was reported in France and Sweden, which raised the question of whether there might not actually be over-all fall in size of the labor force if enough women were to switch from full time to part-time. It was also stated that trends toward a shorter work week in industries in which women predominate in industrial countries might lead to a situation wherein part-time arrangements leave women in an inferior position regarding wages, benefits, and status in general. One possible safeguard which was seen was to include men workers in any arrangements to be made for part-time work.

---

[1] Part-time Employment for Women with Family Responsibilities," Reports and Inquiries, International Labor Review, Vol. LXXV, No. 6 (June 1967), pp. 543-553.

Bruntz, in a 1962 article on part-time women workers in industrial countries, covered much of the same ground, calling on labor and employer organizations to sympathetically search for possible areas for part-time arrangements. She made some specific suggestions as to how technical difficulties might be overcome and called upon government (as had the 1957 group) to facilitate female work activity by provisions of services as well as reform of social security schemes which penalize mothers' employment, a common problem in Europe.[1]

In the same year Hewes discussed the increasingly widespread employment of mothers in the United States as an important contribution to the working of the American economy. Because some industries need workers for a few fixed hours, women were seen as able to fill a need that the full time male worker might reject. This was seen as explaining the concentration of part-time women workers in a few industries, especially the service industries. From the supply viewpoint Hewes reported that the upsurge in part-time women workers was generally believed to be the result of the technology which freed women from the most grinding aspects of household work, a situation which has not yet occurred in France according to Bruntz. Hewes' article is noteworthy for its presentation of psychological factors as being a motivation for employment.[2] Personal satisfaction, as opposed to economic motivation alone, is seen as a reason for increased female involvement in the world of work. Noting industrial problems and increasing union concerns, Hewes suggested that one institution of government long involved in part-time work i.e., the state employment service system, was insufficiently used, both by prospective employers and interested women.[1]

---

[1] Francois Bruntz, Op. Cit., pp. 425-442.

[2] Amy Hewes, "Women Part-time Workers in the United States," International Labor Review, Vol. LXXXV, No. 5 (November 1962), pp. 445-452.

In view of the general discouragement as to the prospects of introducing women into the manufacturing industries and their presumably better-paying employment in periods other than those of full employment, a 1967 report by a Dutch industrial sociologist employed by the Netherlands' Phillips Works is of interest. In describing a workshop for married women in the Netherlands where employment of married women is neither widespread nor socially approved, the sociologist showed how a Private Sector employer, when the motivation was strong enough, could modify conventional working arrangements sufficiently to encourage the labor force entry of a new group of women. While the situation is not analagous to that of the United States, the willingness and ability of a large modern industrial firm to "social engineer" to the extent of modifying "practically all the customary conditions of employment, the geographical, the contractual, the economic, the organizational, the social and physical components" is of interest in view of the pessimism regarding the adaptability of part-time work arrangements to the manufacturing sector.[2]

By 1961 women's groups were sufficiently interested in and cognizant of the problems attached to female aspirations in relation to work to discuss part-time work arrangements in all seven committees set up by the President's Commission on the Status of Women which was appointed by President Kennedy. After due consideration the Commission stated its displeasure with government practices which it had found in its investigations. The Report stated that federal systems of manpower utilization discouraged part-time employment and recommended that the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget facilitate its usage throughout the government service in order that capable women be enabled to participate in government employment opportunities.[1]

---

[1] Hewes, Op. Cit., p. 447.

[2] J.L.J.M. van der Does de Willebois, "A Work Shop for Married Women in Part-time Employment: Implications of an Experiment in the Netherlands," International Labor Review, Vol. 96, No. 6 (December 1967), p. 625.

One reverberation of that recommendation is to be found in a passage in the current federal Personnel Manual which indicates that part-time work arrangements for women are to be offered by federal agencies. No literature has been located which indicates significant implementation of this policy to date.[2]

Despite the reluctance of large scale bureaucracies, including the various levels of government, to become effectively involved in non-standard working arrangements, public fancy has picked up the issue of part-time female employment as one manifestation of the women's liberation movement. A 1973 story in the Wall Street Journal reported on the rise of part-time employment, both clerical and professional, from the human interest point of view. The article, based on spot checks with a few companies and placement agencies, reported both as saying that the upsurge in part-time arrangements was related to the apparent ability of many women to deliberately choose short working hours, either because full time earnings were not viewed as necessary or because of changed life styles which reject full time work (as evidenced in the part-time preferences of some young single persons). One reason for employer interest reported was the frequent elimination of benefit payments to the part-timer. The article pointed out that part-time work is most prevalent in industries where unionization is weakest.[1]

---

[1] American Women, Report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 32.

[2] The Federal Personnel Manual (Washington,D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971).

Important references to part-time work arrangements may be found in two prestigious publications devoted to the woman worker, the OECD's 1954 publication, Women Workers, Hours and Services, by Viola Klein[2] and the United States Department of Labor Women's Bureau 1969 Handbook for Women Workers.[3]

Klein's presentation depends heavily upon the ILO survey made in 1963 and Bruntz's 1962 article, both of which are mentioned above. Klein gives particular attention to the problem of involving women in the manufacturing industries where established schedules of work exist. She thought that manufacturing presented the area of the economy where it was most difficult to strike the necessary balance between the needs of the worker and the continuity of the work process.[4] Klein holds to the traditional view of part-time work as an accommodation to the needs of married women with families, which, at the same time, may be advantageous to some employers, especially in time of a tight labor market. While feeling that part-time work fills a strong social need, Klein recognizes the merit of trade union concerns and suggests that it would be highly desirable to regularize the position of part-timers by giving them the same rights and benefits as other workers. The time to do this, she believed, is when women's position is particularly strong, competitively speaking, as in times of full employment.[1]

---

[1] The Wall Street Journal, March 7, 1973.

[2] Viola Klein, Women Workers, Working Hours and Services, a survey in 21 countries (Paris: 1965). Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, pp.47, 5385-86.

[3] U. S. Department of Labor/Women/s Bureau, Handbook on Women Workers, Bulletin 294,(1969),pp. 44, 45-48, 55-57, 63, 65-67, 79, 105, 157-158, 220-241.

[4] Klein, Op. Cit., p. 49

The Women's Bureau Handbook pulls together statistical material from various Labor Department surveys and special reports, offering conveniently presented empirical data on such topics as age of part-time women workers, differences between men and women, education, job tenure, and unemployment. The subject is presented as being a phenomenon of both women's inability to work full time because of home responsibilities, school attendance, or other reasons and/or inability to find full time work because of lack of skills, education, or availability in their given community.[2] The presentation is particularly useful because of the development of statistics which show which portion of the female work force is freely seeking part-time work as opposed to those involuntarily doing so in response to inability to locate full time employment.[3]

Another Women's Bureau publication (in mimeo), Working Women and their Family Responsibilities: United States Experience, 1971, presents part-time work as an arrangement important in the changing life-cycle activities of American women. This approach sees part-time work as facilitating on-going education and as a re-entry mechanism for the mother who either wants to undertake work for the first time or return to a previous skill which now needs updating. Thus, part-time work, seen in this light, would meet a variety of needs at different points in the life-cylce, many part-timers being likely to return to full time work when children no longer require full time care or when educational needs are met.[1]

---

[1] Klein, Op. Cit., p. 55.

[2] Handbook on Women Workers, Op. Cit., p. 55.

[3] Handbook on Women Workers, Op. Cit., p. 67.

Several other publications which deal with part-time work are not of direct interest to this study and are noted here without extended comment: Return Engagement, a Woman's Guide to Part-time Work and Study in Philadelphia,[2] is directed toward the educated woman, as is a similar 1967 publication for women in the Washington area, Washington Opportunities for Women, A Guide to Part-time Work and Study for the Educated Woman, Washington, D.C.: Robert B. Luce, Inc., 1967. Part-time Social Workers in Public Welfare is a report of an experiment which was operated by Catalyst, a voluntary organization interested in the educated woman, in Boston, Mass., from 1968 through 1970.

Two doctoral dissertations have been written on the part-time help industry, also a neglected field: Mack Moore's The Role of Temporary Help Services in the Clerical Labor Markets[3] and Robert Smith's Analysis of Labor Market

---

[1] U.S. Department of Labor/Women's Bureau for the United Nations, Working Women and their Family Responsibilities: United States Experience (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, July 1971), p. 38.

[2] This is a 1970 publication by the Alumni Associations of Barnard, Bryn Mawr, Mount Holyoke, Radcliffe, Smith, Vassar, Wellesley, and the Univeristy of Pennsylvania Program for Continuing Education for Women, Carol M. Huth, ed.

[3] Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin, 1963).

Adjustments in the Clerical Temporary Help Market, 1953-1960.[1]

Finally, Hallaire, in Part-time Work, frequently cites three reports from the mid 1960's; Gubbel's The Economic Citizenship of Women,[2] L'emploi a Temp Partial by Mm. Schaeffer and Bouchaur,[3] and Rappart General de la Commission de la Main-d'oeuvre pour le Veme Plan.[4]

Summary

The limited literature on part-time employment approaches the subject mainly from the supply point of view. This follows from the motivation of the majority of writers--mostly persons commissioned by organizations either interested in the uplifting of the work force in general or advocates of female economic betterment. The one theoretical work on the subject discusses part-time workers as opposed to part-time employment per se. While some material has been produced throughout the years through surveys as to the location of part-time employment and its reputed benefits to employers, only a rare article such as that by van der Deos de Willebois discusses the recruitment of part-time workers from a demand position. Little information is available regarding the actual circumstances of part-time employment, the hours of work; the benefits accruing to employers from such arrangements as perceived by employers; the administrative problems encountered by employers; and the social resources needed, again from the demand position.

---

[1] Springfield, Virginia. National Technical Information Service, 1971.

[2] Universite Libre de Brussels, 1966.

[3] Documentation Francaise, 1965.

[4] Documentation Francaise, mars 1966.

Most writers on the subject consider part-time employment as largely female in character and concentrate on this group. Morse, who is an exception, sees women as peripheral workers, low in social status and in accessibility to better paying, full time employment, but less stigmatized than other part-time or intermittent workers because their less-than-full time committment to the labor market is often voluntary, in his view, and may actually be a beneficial arrangement for the woman who is also a housekeeper and mother. Morse's use of Becker's "time allocation theory" is significant in that it lays the groundwork for policy recommendations in the area of income provision for mothers. If female heads-of-households who participate in the labor force part-time may be perceived as using the remaining hours of the standard work-week for non-leisure activities, namely, the efforts required for maintaining family life and an adequate level of child-care, a combination of part-time work and non-leisure home activity could be construed as constituting a work-week. The combined remuneration for such "work" activity conceivably might be more generous than the curre "dependency allotments" given to both partially or fully "employed" mothers under the AFDC program of the various states.

To summarize the remaining literature, the important portion of which consists of survey reports, views on the subject have gradually evolved from that of suspicion and disapproval to gradual acceptance as the practice has become increasingly widespread in most industrialized societies during periods of manpower shortages. While it has long been accepted that women work for economic reasons, the reason for choosing part-time employment may or may not be economic i.e., may be a phenomenon of free choice related to family responsibilities or may represent disguised unemployment or underemployment. It may be caused by a desire to supplement men's wages for "pin money" or may be prompted by the desire to raise family income to the subsistence level. Recently discussion of part-time employment has begun to focus on psychological motivations for employment. Most discussions see part-time employment as being primarily connected with the married portion of the female work force and often as a re-entry vehicle by which women with growing families seek to come back into the work force.

The empirical data which is reported generally shows that women part-time workers fill low level, low status, low paying positions which offer little upward mobility. Such work is often steady, rather than intermittent in character.

When the part-time literature attempts to discuss employer benefits accruing from the taking on of a part-time work force, mention is usually made of the efficiency, absenteeism, and turnover issues. Union resistance is often mentioned as an obstacle. Available references in the literature show, however, that at least some unions have long considered how to constructively deal with the problems posed by such work arrangements rather than confining themselves to mere opposition.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

To be maximally useful planning should begin with consideration of demand factors. Therefore this study concentrated on gathering information about employer experiences and attitudes toward part-time work and the part-time worker. The direct mail questionnaire was determined to be the only feasible method by which a large enough number of employees could be reached in the 8-county Philadelphia SMSA. In view of the "Balkanization" of the labor market a large number of more generalized responses were felt to be preferable to the small number of intensive contacts such as could be obtained through the interview method.

The Sample

It was therefore decided to use a mail questionnaire to approach 2,640 employers in the Private and Public Sectors within the Philadelphia SMSA, the 8-counties including, Philadelphia, Montgomery, Delaware, Bucks and Chester in Pennsylvania and Burlington, Camden and Gloucester Counties in the New Jersey portion (known as the Camden Labor Area). The Philadelphia SMSA was thought to be a good one for study purposes as it consistently shows a 2½ per cent representation of the national labor market in all industrial categories except steel-making and ship building, neither women's fields of activity.[1] Therefore findings may have more potential for generalization than studies of most SMSA's. Furthermore the SMSA proved to be a good subject for study as it is both highly urbanized, yet remarkably semi-rural in many aspects important to labor market planning.

The decision to query employers in both sectors of the economy was made because there has been reason to believe that private industry has demonstrated more flexibility in the past in hiring disadvantaged groups than the Public Sector. Since part-time work was known to be widespread in the Private Sector, it was believed that considerable data could be collected regarding experience to date and what further possibilities might exist based on this experience. While many persons have proposed that Public Service types of employment be the main avenue through which members of the peripheral work force be absorbed into the labor force, government thus far has been the sector believed inhospitable to the part-time employee. Dean Morse, in his Theory of the Peripheral Worker, stated that part-time work tended not to be found in large scale bureaucratic organizations including government.[2] Because problems of geography may make accessibility of any Public Service type employment unlikely, Private employment near the locale of one's home may be the only possibility for many disadvantaged persons. On the other hand, the considerable time involved in developing comprehensive lists of all possible local, county, and state employees may be justified by consistent reports that the great increase in government employment has been here.

---

[1] Source: Philadelphia Bureau of Employment Security

[2] Morse, Op. Cit., p. 112.

Private Sector Sample

The Private Sector population to be queried was selected as follows: The names of 1,300 area employers were obtained from Dalton's 1971 Greater Philadelphia Directory, the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce Directory, and other sources including the Yellow Pages of area telephone directories. Employers were selected from the first two directories on the basis of their geographical location, number of employees, and standard industrial classification. The percentage of employers for each county was limited to the rate at which that county contributes to employment in the Greater Philadelphia SMSA. In the case of the Camden Labor Area (Camden, Burlington, and Gloucester Counties), no breakdown is available by county, the selection being determined by the contribution of the Camden Labor Area as a whole. Employers were included only where their industrial category was believed to include at least 30% female workers on their payrolls. "Establishment Data, Female," as given in the journal, Employment and Earnings, provided the information on percentage of female employment.

Nine general industrial groupings are included in this study: Apparel, the Chemical-and-allied industries, Finance-and-insurance, Food-processing, Manufacturing, Paper-and-printing, the Services, Textiles and Trade. Size of payroll was provided for each employer whose name was secured from the industrial directories mentioned above. In the case of names secured through Yellow Pages of the telephone directories, it is believed that most of the employers contacted are small employers, mostly in the 1-24 employee category, but that some may have been as many as 25-to-49 workers.

All known employers of 300-or-more employees in the

SMSA whose industrial category was believed to include at least 30% female workers on its payroll have been contacted; 263 establishments.

The rationale for including the entire known universe of large scale employers who meet the 30% female requirement is that officials of the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce believe that the largest employers (those employing 1,000-workers-or-more) account for about 40% of the employmemt in the SMSA. The experience of the Chamber in Manpower activity has been that large employers are the most responsive in situations where planning and innovation are involved. In examining lists of employers and cross-checking the available industrial directories, it appeared that the number of employers which could be considered moderately large was limited to a modest enough number to make querying of the entire population of employers of 300-or-more workers entirely feasible. This decision was influenced by the high loss rate of employees when employers of fewer-than-30% females were eliminated. Approximately 50% of all the known employers of 300-persons-or-more were lost when this criterion was applied to the lists.

The decision to include an extensive sampling of small business was made as follows: In contra-distinction to the Chamber's views, some Manpower personnel, including The Bureau of Employment Security, believe that small business offers a better potential for part-time work than large. According to the local BES, 85% of all area employers hire fewer-than-25 employees. Therefore it was decided to collect data from small business as well as large to clarify the issue as to which size levels of employer should be the objective of planning efforts in the area of part-time work, should such efforts be under consideration.

The original plan was to develop samples of approximately 200 employers each to secure representative data from area employers who hire 50-to-299 employees, 25-to-49, and 1-to-24, respectively. All of these 600 employers were to have industrial classifications which report at least 30% female on their payroll, with an effort to be made to include those businesses which hire the largest number of women in their operations. However, it is not possible to draw a random sample because of the limitations of industrial directory lists; rather, highly selective choices had to be made.

The sample of employers was drawn, by county, in proportion to which each county contributes employment to the total work force of the SMSA whenever possible. The Camden Labor Area, consisting of Burlington, Camden and Gloucester Counties in New Jersey, includes 18.4% of the total employment in the SMSA, as of the 1970 Census, with data on an individual county basis unavailable.[1] However, a 15% figure was used in making the selection on the basis of information available before 1970 Census figures were available, since this had been the figure given by area experts. Thus the Camden Labor Area was somewhat under-represented in selection of the target population. However, because of the lack of suitable listings in available industrial directories, the under-representation could not have been avoided regardless if these were the only source of names. Telephone Yellow Pages are inadequate as the source of industrial listings in most of the categories studied, even when efforts to supplement directory lists in suburban counties are undertaken. Once the above selections were made, analysis of the lists indicated that, while a good stratification by county and by size of employer (number of workers on the payroll) had been achieved, there were deficiencies in the sampling of smaller employers (299-employees-or-less, but especially with the very smallest group, 1-24 workers), in regard to inclusion of the industries in which women are believed to be the most prominent. The industries which are reportedly the most likely hirers of WIN program graduates were conspicuously absent or seriously under-represented. The same was true for industries believed to be especially active as employers of part-time help.

---

[1] Data, by county, supplied by the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission from Census Tract data in the 1970 Census.

The inadequacy of the above described sample in regard to industrial categories is related to the lack of available listings of smaller employers, especially the smallest. The industrial directories which were used, from careful cross-checking, appear to include all the large employers in the area. However, the listings of smaller employers, except for Philadelphia, are almost of a token nature and appear in some instances to be concentrated on a few industrial groupings. Some industries are barely represented at all. Consultation with the significant local business and industry libraries and other sources revealed that the lack of adequate small business listings is a continuing problem to students of business and Manpower problems.

An effort was made to secure alternative lists by obtaining several different types of tax lists or, alternatively, listings, by industry, from Bell Telephone Company. All proved unsuccessful, in the latter case because the information was not keypunched on Yellow Page data cards and so could not be retrieved. After exhausting all alternatives, the investigator developed lists of selected business in certain service and retail trade areas which were seriously under-represented. This was done by telephoning employers arbitrarily selected from the Yellow Pages of telephone directories, county by county, in the SMSA and requesting the name of the owner or executive officer to whom an inquiry could be directed. While the industrial category could be designated by the investigator and county of residence was known, size of employer was uncertain. However, it was believed that most of these 230 names which were added to the sample were small employers, mostly in the smallest or next-to-smallest size categories, as was the intention.

The specific industrial categories to which additional listings were added were eating-and-drinking places (restaurants and caterers); retail establishments (department and variety stores, women's ready-to-wear, men, boys, and children's wear, shoe stores, pharmacies, and bakeries). Also publishing and printing (binderies); finance and insurance institutions (banks, insurance agencies, credit agencies); service industries (laundries, beauty parlors, employment agencies, maintenance and cleaning organizations).

A problem experienced in list assembly, by telephone, was fear of small employers or their staff to divulge names of employers to be contacted. This was especially true in black areas. However, many owners or managers of small businesses who answered the phone themselves were persuaded to cooperate through this call.

The final Private Sector lists, as secured from the industrial directories and supplemented by telephone contacts, were still deemed insufficient in that they under-represented the small, menial-type employer of large numbers of relatively unskilled women. Since the Thanksgiving and Christmas Seasons were approaching, the decision was made to go ahead despite this problem because of the desire to avoid a survey mailing which would arrive during a busy season for employers. A second, more compelling reason for proceeding, lie in the fact that one objective of this investigation is to ascertain the location of new and possibly more attractive opportunities for women at the entry-level who wish to work part-time. A large amount of data from low-paying service or retail establishments which now are believed to employ large numbers of minimally-skilled women may be revealatory of current practice, but offer no guidance as to more desirable industries to which women might be directed. On this basis over-representation of less traditional and less marginal female employers may be desirable.

Public Sector Sample

It was decided to include under the umbrella term, "Public Sector," both employers in the field of Public Administration, meaning Federal, State, County, and Local Government and employers in which might arbitrarily be termed the "Public Service Area " i.e., organizations dedicated to meeting service-type needs in health, education, and welfare, usually on a non-profit basis, but sometimes entrepreneurial in nature. The total Public Sector list consisted of 1,340 names.

In the area of Public Administration all known employers on the Federal, State, and County levels were approached, thus making it impossible to know what size categories these often over-lapping agencies, departments, bureaus, etc., might represent in regard to number of workers.

On the municipal level all those units of local government with 50,000 population were approached. The limitation placed on approaching municipalities with less-than-50,000 population has severely limited the number of municipalities approached. In Burlington County, the largest County in the State of New Jersey, for example, there are 40 separate political sub-divisions, 3 legally incorporated cities, 31 townships, and 6 boroughs. Yet, according to the 1970 Census, there is not one political sub-division with a population of 50,000 which could be approached for employment data. The reason for placing this limitation on municipal sample selection is that statisticians in the Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment Security and municipal union representatives advised that little employment relevant to the purposes of this study is available in most political sub-divisions. Only several political sub-divisions on the municipal level were considered as reasonable targets outside of the City of Philadelphia, the City of Camden, and several other small cities or townships in the SMSA. In spite of the cited limitations, the use of the 50,000 population figure resulted in the selection of more units of local government for approachment than the above cited advice had suggested. Also included in the public administration groups are institutions and agencies run by these four levels of government.

Another group of service-type employers have been considered as part of the "Public Sector" of the economy, though a few may be profit-making enterprises and/or officially unconnected with government. Labeled the "Public Service" group, this group of employers includes Health-related agencies-and-institutions such as hospitals (administrators and nursing directors were contacted for their diverse bodies of experience), extended care and nursing home facilities. Education-related institutions include colleges and universities and public and private schools (including some large school districts). A selected group of social agencies was approached. Also, a small group of agencies and institutions labeled "Other" because they did not fall directly into any one category, but often performed mixed functions, straddling health and education or education and social-service.

Questionnaires

The questionnaire method was selected because of the need to reach a broad range of employers by industry, size, and location for conclusions to be meaningful. Two slightly different questionnaires were developed for the Public and Private Sectors, both having essentially the same computer program so that comparisons could be made of Public and Private Sector data. They were in leaflet form, with the Public Sector questionnaire containing two additional questions. The substance of the questionnaires closely followed the issues of part-time work as propounded by Jean Hallaire in his report of an International survey of governments regarding part-time work (1968) entitled Part-time Work, its Extent and its Problems, an Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development publication.[1] The questions and format have been influenced by the requirements of computer technology.

The questionnaires were sent out with the name of the individual employer and his number of employees (where known) already entered. A personally signed cover letter and return envelope were included in the mailing.

The questionnaires were mailed to employers in November 1972, 1,300 to employers in the Private Sector and 1,340 to Public Sector employers. Cover letters requested return within a two week period. A reminder post card followed one week later. Due to an unexpectedly heavy return, plans for an extensive telephone effort to secure additional response were canceled. Instead, upon analysis of the character of the respondents, follow-up telephone calls and letters were sent to those among the very largest employers (1,000-or-more workers) who had not responded. A thank-you post card was mailed to all respondents. A total of 1,110 usuable questionnaires were returned. Some returns included letters. In addition letters were also received from employers who did not choose to respond to the questionnaire.

---

[1] Hallaire, Op. Cit.

Questionnaires, post cards, and cover letters are shown in Appendix B.

Interviews

Interviews were held with 20 County Health and Welfare administrators, County Welfare Board officials, including WIN program coordinators, and officials of various local Pennsylvania State Employment Service offices. Discussions were also had with 4 area regional planners, 5 Civil Service officials on both the State and Federal levels, and 7 County personnel officials, as well as 3 Federal agencies. These interviews were helpful in bettering the understanding of the researcher of the problems of the disadvantaged workers in the areas of the SMSA outside the City of Philadelphia and its many resources. The interviews were also helpful in clarifying present policies and practices in regard to part-time employment. Interviews were also held with special groups with particular interest in women's employment, the Women's Bureau, one of the 2 leading women political figures, and 4 health Manpower planners and administrators; also 10 union representatives in fields of special interest in women's employment. The president of the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce was interviewed and was most helpful to the success of the survey in lending the use of his name to the communications to Private Sector employers.

Interviews were also held with some of the largest employers in the SMSA. These included a spokesman for the non-professional employees of the Philadelphia School District as well as 3 administrators of School District programs of particular interest in regard to potential for hiring of minimally-skilled women workers, 2 personnel officials of the City of Philadelphia, and 5 hospital and health-related administrators. The School District and the City of Philadelphia are the two largest employers in the 8-county area in either Sector of the economy. Eight preliminary interviews were also held with some of the largest Private Sector employers. Also, with one large public utility which consented, with reluctance, for an interview to take place.[1]

Statistical Analysis

An examination of the responding employers was made, by number of employees, type of industry, and location, and these were then compared with the similar characteristics of the original mailing lists. Thus, while there was nothing random in the selection of the original lists, it is possible to understand the differences in characteristics of the mailings and the responses through this comparison. The nature of the return is discussed in detail in the section on bias of the respondent group.

---

[1] Because of the unexpectedly large survey return it was found impractical to interview all respondent part-time employers as planned. Some preliminary interviews established that structured interviews with employers would have to cover so many topics and different situations, within plant, as to involve a whole new study. Among topics of particular importance for further exploration are the question of benefits as primary motivation for hiring part-time workers; minimum wage rates as motivation; and the influence of unionization on the decision to utilize part-time workers. Also, to be explored, diverse patterns of usage of different groups within plant.

The first data analysis consisted of obtaining marginals and then cross-tabulating data by industry, size of payroll (controlled for Public and Private sections), and location. The data for employers were analyzed by size categories to identify the size of business or institution most likely to hire or be potential hirers of the women under study. The analysis of industry was made to provide insights as to future directions in planning toward more diversified employment for women.

As Clark Kerr has pointed out,[1] location is one important factor which isolates workers into particular pockets of space, excluding them from alternative employment in the same or other industries. Therefore a geographic analysis, by County, was made to see if the degree of urbanization and reported availability or lacks in public transportation shed any light on the current ability of women to find part-time work or to have potential sources of employment within Counties. It was recognized that the small number of respondents in certain Counties, coupled with varied conditions, makes this analysis weak. Nevertheless, it was attempted to see what information might be elicited, since little investment in additional effort was involved.

---

[1] Clark Kerr, "Balkanization of Labor Markets," in Bakke E. Wight, ed. Labor Mobility and Economic Opportunity (New York: Technology Press at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley and Sons, 1954), pp. 92-111.

Recent 1970 Census data for the SMSA were useful in supplementing and interpreting the findings of this study. Data secured from 1970 Census tapes provided in publications of the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission were also helpful. Cross-tabulations of data were made to establish association between individual findings, both as a validity check and for purposes of information.

The analysis of Public Sector data is chiefly (1) by type of employer, Federal, State, County, Municipal, Colleges-and-universities, Health agencies-and-institutions, Social agencies, Schools, and "Other" categories established by the investigator as most suitable for the purpose at hand (and unrelated to standard industrial classifications for these employers, as the latter did not appear useful) and (2) by location, meaning by County. While an analysis was made according to size of employer, this has limited value where government is involved since there are overlapping responses from higher and lower levels of administration as well as instances where policy is set in higher places.

Analysis was made of the data supplied by Public employers as opposed to Private employers, item by item, to discern differences. The purpose of this search was to determine whether such approaches to women workers as Public service employment and/or New Careers programs would appear to be more-or-less fruitful than efforts in the Private Sector for the group under consideration.

Collection of Background Data

Material relating to welfare case loads, their number and location, the (WIN) Work Incentive Program, Public Service Employment--an official program--and other such material were obtained through telephone and personal interviews with officials in appropriate agencies in the SMSA.

Information regarding transportation problems of the Welfare or potential Welfare population was obtained from Welfare officials, supplemented by 1970 Census data.

Civil Service officials, State and Federal, in both states supplied information of policies and practice in the area of merit systems. Union officials were helpful in providing information, as was the leading woman political figure in local government.

Personnel directors of large business, in particular, offered information and insights into their experience with aspects of part-time hiring practice, as requested. Full utilization of this willingness to provide material on the subject was not possible as it appeared a new study would have to be organized to deal with the material.

Bias in the Survey Data

An effort was made to determine the representativeness of the data collected in two ways: (1) comparisons between questionnaires sent out and the percentage returned by Industrial or Public Sector employer category, by size, and by county of location; (2) by comparing the relative proportion of the respondents by industry, participating in the survey with the actual amount of employment in the same categories existent in the Greater Philadelphia SMSA. A brief statement is given on a third issue which is believed to affect representativeness, level of unionization of the respondents.

Comparisons of Mailings and Return

Public versus Private

Return was higher in the Public Sector than in the Private; of 1,340 Public Sector mailings, 672 or 51 per cent were returned. In the Private Sector, of 1,300 mailings, 438 or 35 per cent were returned.

Comparison by Industry. Thirty-five per cent of all Private Sector employers returned their questionnaires, as noted above, there being an 18% range in rates of return. As shown on Table 1, Manufacturing occupies the median position at 34%. The Chemical-and-allied industries responded at a 45% rage; Food-processing at 44%; Finance-and-insurance at 41%; and Trade at 40%. Below the median level is Paper-and-printing at 33%; Services at 31%; Textiles at 30%; and Apparel at 27%.

Table 1

RATE OF RESPONSE OF INDUSTRIAL CATEGORIES[1]

Industry	Rate of Response
Chemical-and-allied industries........	45%
Food-processing.......................	44
Finance-and-insurance.................	41
Trade.................................	40
Manufacturing.........................	34
Paper-and-printing....................	33
Services..............................	31
Textiles..............................	30
Apparel...............................	27

As may be seen the groups proportionally most heavily represented are the Chemical-and-allied industries and the Food-processing. The least represented is the Apparel industry which was heavily solicited.

Comparison by Public Sector Employer. In the Public Sector, which on an overall basis returned an average of 51% of mailings, there is great variation in return, far more than in the Private Sector, largely because of the higher response levels of some groups.

---

[1] Nine questionnaires were received from two industrial classifications not included because of small numbers, building materials and furniture and transportation, communication, etc. These cases are included in the 438 Private Sector sets of data, other than in regard to analysis by industrial category.

The County employers, with a return of 41% are in mid-range position. The group with the highest return are Colleges, 75% participating. Health agencies-and-institutions returned at a 56% rate, while Schools returned at 54%. Forty-eight per cent of the Social agencies returned. Lower return levels come from the public administration sector. While County employers are mid-range, only about one-third of Federal[1] and State employers responded, while only 28% of Municipal agencies returned. About one-third of the small group identified as "Other" returned. This return is shown on Table 2.

TABLE 2

RATE OF RESPONSE OF PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYERS

Public Sector Employer	Rate of Response
Colleges-and-universities.............	75%
Health agencies-and-institutions......	56
Schools...............................	54
Social agencies.......................	48
County................................	41
Federal...............................	34
State.................................	33
Other.................................	33
Municipal.............................	28

As may be noted from the above, a disproportionately heavy return came from a relatively few Colleges-and-universities (39 from a total population of 52); and the least return came from Municipal employers. The Health agencies-and-institutions and Social agencies not only gave a high rate of return, but represent large numbers.

---

[1] As noted elsewhere, many Federal employers, while declining to participate, wrote explanatory letters which, if considered, would serve to increase Federal response.

Response in Regard to Size of Payroll

Private Sector

The rate of return achieved in regard to size categories is only partially known. This is because 230 questionnaires were sent out to supplement inadequate lists in the Service and Trade fields. It is believed that most of these enterprises are small employers, but sone of the retail establishments may have been employers of as many as 50-to-299 employees.

It can be said with surety that of the larger employers, the 115 known employers of 300-to-499 workers appear to have returned 37% of the questionnaires sent out; 57% of the 76 known employers of 500-to-999 workers returned, while 68% of the 72 known employers of 1,000-or-more workers returned. The large percentage return for the two largest employer groups is, in part, the result of a follow-up mailing and telephone calls made to some of the very largest employers. It should be noted that, in a number of cases, firms believed to be employers of several thousand workers (as indicated by industrial directory data) reported themselves in the 500-to-999 category. Sometimes this was due to partial plant relocation in other communities.

Since the comparatively few large employers account for a greatly disproportionate amount of the total employment in the SMSA (according to the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce), over-representation of larger employers is justified and welcome. Among smaller employers, since overall return was 35% and the largest number of employers queried were in the under-300-group, it would seem reasonable that, of the 230 employers in Trade and Services whose size is unknown, but believed to be small, that a less than 35% return was achieved. If all 230 employers of unknown size are added to the 755 known employers of fewer-than-300 workers who were sent questionnaires, it would appear that the average return was 31% for these three groups of smaller employers, taken as a whole.

Public Sector

In the Public Sector no prior information existed in terms of size of employer since lists were compiled by the researcher. Many agencies and institutions representing overlapping jurisdiction over employees were surveyed, so number of employees would only be determined by employer report. Therefore, rate of return by size is unknown. Problems of definition of the scope of the organization in the case of public administration would probably make such data unusable were it available.

Response by County

The percentage response, by County, varies enormously. The range is from 16% in Camden County to 60% in Chester County. Table 3 shows that Burlington County (36%) and Bucks County (35%) are mid-range, while Philadelphia County (30%), and Camden County (16% returned at lowest rates.

Comparison of Female Employment in SMSA, by Industry, with Distribution of Response

The following comparison of actual female employment in the SMSA industry with the proportional representation of each industry in the questionnaire return, was made at the suggestion of Dr. Ann Miller, specialist in demography of the labor force, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania. This comparison, shown on Table 4, offers

TABLE 3

RATE OF RESPONSE TO SURVEY, BY COUNTY

County	Percentage of Response
Chester	60%
Gloucester	57
Montgomery	43
Burlington	36
Bucks	35
Delaware	33
Philadelphia	30
Camden	16

Table 3 shows two of the most rural Counties reporting at highest levels while the two most urbanized Counties returned the lowest proportion of questionnaires.

some indication as to the correspondence between employer response, as represented in the total Private Sector return, and proportion of women workers in each industry, as reported by the recent 1970 Census. This comparison is not a good measure of the representativeness of the findings, since a few very large respondent employers speak for a disproportionately large amount of the employment in the SMSA. Nevertheless Table 4 offers a reasonably current overview of the female employment situation, by industry, and its relationship to the proportion of reportage of SMSA employers, by industry, to this survey.

As may be noted from the table, employers who responded to the survey are greatly over-represented in 4 of the 9 categories studied: Apparel, Chemical-and-allied industries, Food-processing and Textilers. In these industries the percentage of female employment in the SMSA represented by the industry is far less than the proportion of industry return to the survey. The Food-processing and Apparel industries, while providing about

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF FEMALE WORKERS IN SMSA, PER CENT OF INDUSTRY FEMALE, PERCENTAGE OF ALL PRIVATE SECTOR FEMALE EMPLOYMENT IN SMSA, AND PERCENTAGE OF PRIVATE SECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE, BY INDUSTRY

Type of Industry	Number of Female Workers in SMSA	Percentage of Industry Female	Percentage of all Female Employment in SMSA	Percentage of Private Sector Questionnaires in the Study (N=438)
Apparel	30.909	72%	6%	11%
Chemical-and-allied industries	22,825	19	4	8
Finance-and-insurance	50,518	52	10	14
Food-processing	10,526	29	2	7
Manufacturing	53,859	23	10	15
Paper-and-printing	18,342	31	4	5
Services	102,304[a]	68	19	12
Textiles	11,000	52	2	6
Trade	142,816	43	27	22
Total	467,982[b]		84%[c]	100%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of the Population: 1970, Detailed Characteristics, Final Report PC(1) D 32 New Jersey, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1972. Table 186.

[a] Services do not include "professional and related Services" which account for 122,779 female workers.

[b] This figure does not include 1,526 women workers in building materials and construction or the 23,357 women in a wide range of industries including communication, transportation, gas, electricity, water and sewage from which nine questionnaires were received.

[c] Less than 100% of female employment is indicated since industries with very low current female participation were not studied.

2% of the female employment in the SMSA, constitute 6% to 7% of questionnaire return. Apparel, which hires almost 6% of the female employment in the SMSA constitutes almost 11% of the questionnaire return. The Chemical-and-allied industries, hiring a little over 4% of all women workers in the SMSA has returned 8% of all questionnaires.

In industries other than those mentioned above, while there may be considerable differences in contribution to female employment in the SMSA and the contribution to the study, the ratios are not so great. While Manufacturing provides 10% of female employment in the SMSA, it represents 15% of the questionnaire return. Paper-and-printing shows less discrepency; while contributing to almost 4% of SMSA female employment it returned almost 5% of the Private Sector questionnaires. Finance-and-insurance, which contributes almost 10% of the female portion of SMSA employment, returned 14% of the questionnaires received.

In two important cases industries are under-represented, as was feared from the onset, because of problems of obtaining lists of small employers in these fields. While Tradespeople provide 27% of the female employment in the SMSA, they contributed only 22% of the questionnaire return. While the Services provide almost 20% of the female employment in the SMSA, employers in this broad field contributed only 12% of the questionnaire return. This occurred despite special effort to obtain listings in these two fields and phone contacts with some employers in these fields prior to the actual mailing.

The above discrepencies in percentage of employment provided by each industry and representation in the return does not necessarily mean that the data obtained are unrepresentative or not useful. First, some employers contribute much more employment than others. Second, one of the objectives of this study is to develop data which might be helpful in planning for extension of part-time employment of minimally-skilled women to new sectors of the economy which might offer better opportunities to them. A heavy representation of views from fields of employment which offer little does not necessarily further the objectives of this work. Since reportage is given of employer practices and views by industry, the reader has the opportunity to consider each industry's views and experience separately, without regard to problems related to degree of representation in the total population studied.

Comparison of Female Employment in SMSA, by Public Sector Employer, by Distribution of Response

A similar comparison in the Public Sector shows there is under-representation of public administration. While 14% of the female SMSA employment is with the Federal Government, only 7% of the Public Sector response was this employer group (this, however, is somewhat deceptive since a good number of Federal employers wrote in to say they could not participate because they do not engage in part-time hiring, etc.); 9% of the female Public Sector employment is with either the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or State of New Jersey, while only 6% of the return came from State agencies and institutions. Thirty-one per cent of the female employment in the SMSA is with the local government (county and municipal), whereas only 11% of the return is from this source.[1]

---

[1] Data source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, Detailed Characteristics, Final Report (PC(1) D 32 New Jersey, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1972).

The under-representation of governmental agencies and institutions is believed due to several factors. First, despite the large amount of "local" employment (meaning Municipal and County employment) indicated in the 1970 Census (about 57 per cent in all SMSA governmental employment), probably over half is with two single employers, the City of Philadelphia and the School District of Philadelphia.[1] The number of employer respondents from these two sources may not be numerically large, but cover jobs and critical programs which are important to non-professional women. Interviews were also held with relevant department heads. Second, while the accumulative number of women in local government employment may seen high, except for a few large institutions, it is difficult to find many units which have enough employment to make approachment worthwhile, in line with the objectives of this study. Some of the governmental employers who did respond said as much themselves. On the advice of experts familiar with local government employment in the SMSA, the investigator did not attempt to reach municipalities of less than 50,000 population on the grounds that little employment, beyond political patronage jobs for men and a limited amount of clerical work for women, existed. This severely limited the return, which still was relatively poor for what was mailed. Response, unfortunately, from the City of Camden, both administrative and institutional, was also very poor, again reducing Municipal return.

In conclusion, despite a great deal of time and energy spent developing comprehensive lists of governmental agencies and institutions on all levels, return was poor. After studying the data received in both sectors of the economy, a further reason for low governmental return appears. The employers who returned tend to be current employers of part-time women workers. However, this is least true among governmental employers. Probably many governmental employers did not return because they do not engage in the practice of part-time employment and felt they had little to report. Third, as shown on Table 5, only "local" government (county and municipal) reports hiring as many as 30% female workers on its payrolls. Taken as a whole, Federal agencies report 27% and State agencies and institutions 15%. Had these groups been in the Private Sector, they would not have been included in the survey, as explained earlier in this chapter. While efforts were made to limit mailings to departments of government believed to hire a reasonably high proportion of women workers, in many cases, nevertheless, female employment may have been negligible. This would be another factor limiting return.

---

[1] The City of Philadelphia and the School District are believed to hire about 58,000 employees. It was not possible to obtain a breakdown by sex.

In the Public Service group, the health field return is almost exactly equivalent to the proportion of women workers in the Public Sector of the SMSA; about one-third. Social welfare, however, is greatly over-represented, accounting for only 7% of the female employment in the SMSA, but a third of the questionnaire return.

It may be noted, from the above commentary as well as from Table 5, that the percentages referred to total more than 100%. This occurs because the figures given for "government," Federal, State and local, overlap with the government workers included in the categories, "Health," "education," and "welfare." While somewhat confusing, this is consistent with the analysis of the survey data and, in fact, the dual status of many Public Sector employers.

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF FEMALE WORKERS IN SMSA, PER CENT OF PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER FEMALE, PERCENT OF ALL PUBLIC SECTOR FEMALE EMPLOYMENT IN SMSA, AND PERCENTAGE OF PUBLIC SECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE

Type of Public Sector Employer	Number of Female Workers in SMSA (Public Sector) (N=219,950)	Percentage Female	Percentage of Female Employment in SMSA (Public Sector)	Percentage of Public Sector Questionnaire Response (N=672)
Public Administration				
Federal	31,138	27%	14%	7%
State	19,234	16	9	6
Local (County and Municipal)	67,277	57	31	11
Public Service Employment				
Health	75,003	71	34	33
Education[a]	81,807	62	37	11
Welfare, Religious Organizations, etc.[b]	14,437	54	7	33
Other	18,032	--	--	--

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of the Population: 1970, Detailed Characteristics, Final Report PC(1) D-32 New Jersey, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1972, Table 186.

[a] Includes all "schools" plus "colleges and universities."

[b] Includes all social agencies and "others." Percentages of Female Employment (Public Sector) exceeds 100 per cent as there is overlapping between categories.

In regard to the excess of Social agencies included in this survey, the very large number were contacted because Social agencies, in periods of government spending in recent years, have often expanded their programs and their job categories to include paraprofessionals who, when mothers, might have the desire or need to work part-time only. It was desired to discover how many agencies or institutions in the Greater Philadelphia SMSA had actually instituted New Careers or other programs of a paraprofessional nature which still survive. Such programs might lend themselves to pioneering in part-time work arrangements in the Public Sector.

As mentioned above, the number of "Schools" reporting is small; yet some reporters speak for whole school districts, including parts or the whole of the School District of Philadelphia and so cover a great deal of employment and a variety of programs.

In summary, the Public Sector survey return greatly over-represents the Social agencies in comparison with the amount of employment these fields contribute to women in the SMSA. The survey return greatly under-represents government employment on all levels. As noted above, this last is partially mitigated by the fact that the two largest SMSA employers, the School District of Philadelphia, and the City of Philadelphia, accounting for about 58,000 jobs (male and female, no sex breakdown being available), have been included, both by a number of questionnaire returns and by interviews. Since data regarding each category of employer are given separately in each section of the findings of this study the lack of balance in the reportage from the survey does not represent an insurmountable obstacle to study of the subject from the data collected.

Union versus Non-Union Response

Inasmuch as some union leaders who were interviewed believed that the fact of unionization affects both the decision to use part-time workers as well as the circumstances of usage, the rate of unionization among respondent employers is an issue in study bias. Forty-two per cent of the Private Sector employers and 40% of the Public Sector employers who responded to the survey indicated they are organized. According to a knowledgeable union leader, this would appear to be a little lower than the over-all level of unionization in the 8-counties in regard to the Private Sector. In view of recent organizing activities in the Public Sector, the 40% would appear to be a good representation.[1]

Summary on Bias

A 42% return was achieved in regard to a mailing of 2,640 questionnaires (correcting for bad addresses and other undelivered questionnaires). There was a 35% return in the Private Sector; a 51% return in the Public Sector. Great variations exist in the rate of return by industry and by Public Sector employer. In the Private Sector there is a great rate of return from some lesser employers of women and a lower level of return from some of the big traditional hirers. In the Private Sector there is a very large numerically high return from the Health and Social agencies. Colleges returned questionnaires at the highest levels while governmental agencies and institutions returned at lower rates than the Service group.

---

[1] This is especially so if it is considered that the bulk of non-union employers must come fromthe large number of social agency employers who reported.

The larger employers in the Private Sector are more heavily represented, by proportion, than smaller employers. This is by intent, due to their greater hiring power and lesser numbers. In the Public Sector, size of employer was unknown at the time of mailing, so no report can be given on return, by size.

The return, when considered by County, shows Philadelphia and Camden employers returning at lesser rates than the suburban counties in the SMSA. The two least urbanized counties returned at markedly higher rates than other counties.

In regard to the amount of female employment each industrial category contributes to the SMSA in comparison with the extent to which that industry contributes data to this study, 4 industrial categories are over-represented--Apparel, Chemical-and-allied industries, Food-processors, and Textilers. Trade and the Services are under-represented, despite initial efforts to correct for this possibility.

The problem of relative contribution of Public Sector employers to the study is more serious. The government agencies and institutions are represented to an extent considerably below their relative contribution to Public Sector SMSA female employment. Social agencies and Health agencies-and-institutions are greatly over-represented. It is believed that governmental employers declined to participate more heavily because they do not engage in much part-time hiring and saw the study as irrelevant to them.

In explanation, it is believed that the return for this questionnaire represents a self-selected group which tends to have experience in part-time hiring. More is believed to have come from the Public Sector because of greater sense of duty among the groups included. Differences in return, by size, relate in large part to special efforts made by the investigator. Differences between the hub counties of Philadelphia and Camden and the suburban counties appear to be related to differences in experience and attitudes toward part-time employment on the part of employers. In regard to the Private Sector, it is not clear to the investigator why some groups returned at such markedly higher rates than others. Lesser employers of part-time women workers in the Private Sector tend to return at a rate higher than their level of participation in part-time hiring (as per their own reports). In the Public Sector the reverse is true. It is believed the governmental employers returned at low rates because of lack of appreciable part-time hiring experience. Conversely, it is believed that Colleges-and-universities returned at the highest rate because, by their own report, colleges are the most frequent employers of part-time female help.

In regard to unionization, the ratio of unionized to non-unionized employers in the Public Sector appears to be a reasonable reflection of the local situation; in the Private Sector, a little low.

Verification of Punching and Coding

Accuracy of key punching was verified by having each card punched twice and compared.

Accuracy of coding was dealt with by having approximately 10% (103) of the questionnaires coded a second time and a comparison made. About a 2% difference was observed. Reference to the original data reveal that a large portion of this error is attributable to problems in the coding of several questions and, in particular, one variable, most of this material either not being reported in this study or being very peripheral in nature. More specifically, much of the coding "error" lies in the second coding. Originally the coders were well trained in dealing with notes and comments written in by respondents; also they had special instructions as to how to deal with the large numbers of qualified responses and remarks of "inapplicable" which were received in relation to certain questions. By the time of the second coding, the special instructions were often forgotten (or coding manuals not so carefully utilized). Much of the error relates to portions of the questions on Civil Service and paraprofessional programs. There is also a concentration of error related to recording qualifications concerning seasonal levels of employment, this data not being reported upon in this study for other reasons.

Computer Programs

The computer work for this study was done on an IBM 360, Model 44 Computer, using Special Programs for the Social Sciences, Crosstabs, as well as additional Fortran Programs for material unsuitable for SPSS packages.

Appropriateness of Significance Tests

Tests of significance were not used in regard to findings as they are not appropriate. The target population was not selected randomly nor is it known that other conditions for use of tests are met.[1]

---

[1] The inappropriate use of significance tests is discussed throughout Morrison and Henkel's book, the Significance Test Controversy (Chicago: Aldine Press, 1970).

CHAPTER IV

NON-STANDARD WORK PATTERNS

The major thrust of this inquiry is to obtain a clearer picture of current usage of part-time work arrangements in the Greater Philadelphia SMSA. This study concerns itself with non-standard work arrangements in regard to time.[1] The inquiry is limited to part-time work arrangements which involve relatively unskilled women workers. Since the majority of minimally-skilled women in our society occupy a relatively few occupational positions which are widely distributed throughout the occupational-industrial matrix it has been relatively easy to locate employers of such women. Over 90% of the employers who responded to this survey reported that they hire such women for the types of entry-level positions as were prominently presented at the beginning of the survey instrument.[2] Most of these 1,004 employers (of the original 1,110) further stated that they had had recent experience in hiring such women on a part-time basis. Seven hundred ninety-seven of these employers, about 72% of all the survey respondents, reported such recent hiring experience.

---

[1] This differs from efforts to study and influence the place of employment, such as recommended in the recent Klausner study, Op. Cit., p. xix.

[2] The positions presented as "typical entry level positions" were selected from the Occupational Outlook Handbook, U.S. Department of Commerce (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968-69).

The reportage of the above mentioned 797 employers who have reported on their actual experience with non-standard work arrangements is presented in this chapter. The first section offers findings related to identification of general patterns of part-time work arrangements, whether they are part-time in relation to the standard workday or the employer's standard work-week; whether the workers are part of the regular work complement of the establishment or, in fact, casual labor, brought in to meet special unpredictable needs or seasonal demand; and whether such work arrangements exist throughout the job categories or are restricted to certain categories only. The second section identifies the shorter-than-normal shifts which are in usage during the 24 hour day. Material will be presented in the third and fourth sections of this chapter concerning employer expression of willingness to consider new part-time work arrangements and shifts. The chapter concludes with a profile of the part-time employer as deduced from the findings offered in this chapter and a comment as to the prospects for future extension of non-standard work patterns.

Non-Standard Work Arrangements in Usage

Before discussing the findings regarding patterns of non-standard work arrangements and short shift usage, the subject of this chapter, a brief statement of findings in regard to the prevalence of part-time employment is in order. Tables 1 through 5 providing detailed information are in Appendix A.

While it is clear that respondents who returned the questionnaires constitute a self-selected group with more than usual interest in the subject, nevertheless there are some who returned questionnaires who do not engage in the practice of part-time employment. Differences appear by sector of the economy, industrial category, size, and county of location. Particularly helpful in interpreting various findings in regard to differences among industries and Public Sector employers has been the rankings of Private and Public Sector industries according to their relative standing in regard to the reported prevalence of part-time employment.

As stated earlier, 797 employers (70%) of the 1,110 respondents to the questionnaire reported that they have had recent experience hiring women on a part-time basis. Sixty-eight per cent of the 438 Private employers reported such experience; 74% of the respondent 672 Public employers. While the differences between Private and Public Sectors is not large, differences among the various employer groups within the Sectors vary considerably. In the Private Sector the range is from 43% in the Textile industry to 87% in Trade; in the Public Sector, from 29% among reporting Health agencies-and-institutions to 92% of reporting Colleges-and-universities. The relative standing of the Private and Public Sector employers in regard to reportage of employment of part-time women workers is given in Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix A.

Size of payroll is one criterion by which data in this inquiry were studied. In regard to reportage of the prevalence of part-time employment of females in the SMSA, in the Private Sector, differences by size are very slight with one exception. The smallest employers, those with 1-to-24 employees, report less part-time hiring experience than employers with greater payrolls, 63%, whereas from 69% to 72% of all other employers report such experience. In the Public Sector, the smallest employers also report less recent experience with the hiring of part-time women workers than other size groups. However, differences are greater.

The range is from 64% to 95%, without any pattern in relation to size. These data are given in detail on Table 3 in Appendix A.

Differences occur between levels of reportage of recent experience in the employment of part-time women workers by County of location. The range is from 59% in Camden County to 81% in Montgomery County, a suburban County in the Pennsylvania portion of the SMSA. As will be seen from examination of Table 4 in Appendix A, Philadelphia County employers and Camden County employers report less recent experience hiring part-time women workers than their suburban counties, respectively. Seventy-one per cent of Philadelphia employers reported hiring part-timers, while as many as 81% of the Montgomery County employers so reported. In the New Jersey portion of the SMSA, 59% of the respondent Camden County employers reported such recent hiring experience, while as many as 71% of Gloucester County employers so reported. As may be seen from Table 5 in Appendix A, there is little relationship between degree of urbanization, as given by the 1970 Census, and overall reportage of levels of employer experience with part-time employment. Even though Philadelphia and Camden are the traditional centers of industrialization in the SMSA and the least apt to report part-time hiring, Montgomery County, the heaviest reporter is also heavily urbanized and also a heavy hirer. With the exception of Montgomery County, it might be stated that the less urbanized counties in each portion of the SMSA report more recent experience with the hiring of part-time women workers than their "hub" counties i.e., Philadelphia and Camden Counties, respectively. As will be noted from inspection of Table 4 in Appendix A, reported part-time hiring in the New Jersey portion of the SMSA exists at a lower rate than in the Pennsylvania portion.

The above reported differences between the "hub" counties and their suburban satellites are consistent with differences observed in rates of return by Philadelphia and Camden County employers, differences in reportage on various practices, issues and attitudes throughout this inquiry. In general, respondent employers in these two highly industrialized centers are less interested, less particapatory in the practice of part-time employment, and less optimistic about future possibilities of this practice than employers in other counties.

Greater Philadelphia SMSA employers, as Table 6 shows, when the data are considered as a whole, report more part-time arrangements by the week than by the day, but the margin of difference is very slight, 66% to 64%. In regard to stability of part-time work arrangements, SMSA employers have substantiated Bancroft's[1] conclusion that part-time

TABLE 6

NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS IN USAGE

Non-Standard Work Arrangements	Percentage of Usage (N=797)
Short Work-Day..............................	64%
Short Work-Week.............................	66
Steady Work.................................	51
Intermittent Work...........................	37
Some Jobs...................................	68
All Jobs....................................	10

The percentages are based on the 797 employers who reported recent experience hiring women part-time workers.

---

[1] Bancroft, Op. Cit., p. 103

employment for women tends to be steady in nature rather than casual or seasonal; 410 (51%) of the users of part-time workers report offering steady work as opposed to 293 (37%) who report usage on an intermittent basis. These employers have also demonstrated the correctness of Bancroft's contention that only certain jobs are open to women who wish to work less than the usual work-day or week.[1] Only 77 employers (10%) said that all job categories are open to part-time arrangements; 544 (68%) specified that present non-standard arrangements pertain only to some job categories.

Another finding is that almost half of the employers who report hiring non-standard days or weeks use a combination of both. Cross-tabulation established that 338 (48%) of the 701 employers who responded specifically to the two question-options concerning part-day or part-week arrangements actually use a combination of each. The same cross-tabulations show that 189 (27%) part-time employers report hiring part-time help on a short-week basis only, while 174 (25%) report hiring for short-days only. One seeming conclusion is that the prevalent pattern of part-time hiring is an abbreviated work-week consisting of several less-than-standard work-days. This conclusion must be tentative for some of the 338 employers reporting both abbreviated arrangements by day and week may be reporting short-days for workers in some job categories and short-weeks for workers in others. Also, the picture in two sectors of the economy varies.

Arrangements According to Time

Public versus Private Usage

When usage of part-time arrangements is considered in reference to the type of employer, Private Sector or Public, some interesting differences emerge regarding current practices. See Table 7 for the data, controlled in this way.

---

[1] Bancroft, Op. Cit., p. 100

TABLE 7

NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS IN USAGE, BY TYPE OF EMPLOYER

Non-Standard Work Arrangement	Percentage of Usage	
	Private Sector (N=298)	Public Sector (N=499)
Short Work-Day..............	65%	64%
Short Work-Week............	58	71
Steady Work................	44	56
Intermittent Work..........	38	36
Some Jobs...................	56	75
All Jobs....................	13	7

Percentages are based on the number of employers reporting recent experience hiring women part-time workers.

While the over-all data show slightly higher usage of the short work-week, practices differ considerably between the Public and Private Sectors. Private Sector employers appear to favor the short work-day over the short-week (65% to 58%) while Public Sector employers favor the short-week over the non-standard day (71% to 64%).

Curiously, in regard to each other, preferences for the short work-day are about equal. It is in regard to the part work-week that Private and Public Sector employers differ strongly. Seventy-one per cent of the Public Sector employers report a short work-week, while only about 58% of the Private employers so report.

Type of Industry

Considerable differences exist between the practices of the various industrial groups in regard to part-time work arrangements.

Some employers report short-day arrangements to be much more prevalent in their industries than the short work-week. This is true especially for the Food-processors (63% to 32%), Apparel industry (69% to 54%), Paper-and-printing (73% to 45%), and the Manufacturers (49% to 35%). See Table 8. On the other hand, Tradespeople (about 71% each) Finance-and-insurance (68% to 53%) report usage of both types of arrangements at very similar levels. Only the Finance-and-insurance group reports more prevalent part-time arrangements (and this only by the margin of one employer) than part-day (70% to 68%). One explanation which might be attempted to explain this finding would be that continuous process industries require workers at the machines at all times; that absence during a particular day would mean valuable machinery would stand idel. However, one of the continuous process industries shows lesser differences in pattern than others, Textiles. More specific information regarding usage within the plants is needed to explain this data. According to employers who were interviewed, some plants, for example, use part-timers to operate expensive machinery between shifts, during lunch breaks, and to cover during illnesses. Others use such workers to perform specific tasks reserved for them.

Textilers and Manufacturers report hiring for part-day arrangements at a lesser rate than any other industrial category, 50% and 49%, respectively. They are also among the groups to report the least part-week arrangements, 42% and 35%, respectively.

TABLE 8

NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS IN USAGE, BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY

Non-Standard Work Arrangement	Type of Industry								
	Apparel (N=26)	Chemical and allied ind. (N=13)	Finance and ins. (N=50)	Food processing (N=19)	Manufacturing (N=43)	Paper and printing (N=11)	Services (N=40)	Textiles (N=12)	Trade (N=84)
Part Day	69%	77%	68%	63%	49%	73%	58%	50%	71%
Part Week	54	69	70	32	35	45	53	42	71
Steady Work	50	38	40	42	26	73	43	42	51
Intermittent Work	27	46	36	16	42	55	43	25	40
Some Jobs	62	92	72	21	51	82	55	67	45
All Jobs	15	8	4	11	5	9	13	8	26

N= number of employers in each industrial category who reported recent experience in the hiring of women part-time workers.

The Food-processors who are middle-range among the users of part-day arrangements, report that only about 32% of their employers have short-week arrangements. Curiously, a very large majority of the Chemical-and-allied industries which do not tend to be very large hirers of women as a group, report high rates of hiring both for the short-day and week, 77% and 69%, respectively.

Forty-nine per cent of the Manufacturers reporting recent part-time hiring experience indicated they hire for the short-day and 35% say they hire for a short work-week. Also of interest, the Services, often considered as a female dominated area, report both part-day and part-week employment at lower levels than other industries even though the type of work suggests more adaptability to non-standard arrangements. Only 58% of the Service employers report hiring part-day and 53% for the short work-week.

One observation which may be made concerning employer behavior regarding preference for the short-day over the short-week is that the industrial group who most frequently report hiring women part-timers are those who report hiring both part-day and week at fairly similar levels.

Public Sector Employer

In the Public Sector most employer categories also report a preference for short-day arrangements as opposed to the short work-week. The exceptions are the Health agencies-and-institutions, the Social agencies, and County employers (some of whom are also Health-institution employers). It is the large numbers of employers in the first two mentioned groups which swelled the reportage of short work-week arrangements which is seen in the data as a whole. About 82% of the Health agencies-and-institutions and 72% of the Social agencies who are users hire workers for a less-than-standard work-week, while reporting less part-time employment by the short-day, 54% and 67%, respectively.

While Public Sector employers vary among themselves in regard to how many report short-week arrangements, the very large differences in reportage between employment practices involving the short-week as opposed to the short-day (with one exception) do not exist as in the Private Sector. See Table 9. In other words, women wishing to work fewer days than usual in the week would be more likely to find such employment in the Public Sector than in the Private. In the Public Sector itself, Health agencies-and-institutions, Social agencies, and Colleges-and-universities would be particularly good targets for such job seekers. Conversations with public administration agencies suggest that, while reportage of the existence of part-time employment may be high, numbers of part-timers, with certain special exceptions, are believed to be very small. Census statistics on part-time employment in local government confirms this.[1]

State, County, and Health agencies-and-institutions are the Public Sector groups reporting part-time arrangements at the lowest levels, 36%, 54% and 54%, respectively. Women desiring employment for only a portion of a day would be best off approaching schools, colleges and universities, and certain federal employers; also certain types of social agency, educational-type public service agencies and institutions included among "Other" because they are not strictly in either category.

---

[1] In 1970, 5,221 (4.7%) of local government employees in the SMSA were part-time workers (per cent female is unknown). "Local government" includes County and Municipal employment.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Local Government Employment in Metropolitan Areas and Large Counties: 1971. Series G E 71-No. 3, U.S. Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1972, Table 2.

TABLE 9

NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS IN USAGE, BY PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Non-Standard Work Arrangement	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Fed-eral (N= 18)	State (N= 11)	County (N=28)	Muni-cipal (N=7)	Colleges and univer-sities (N=36)	Health agencies and inst. (N=196)	Schools (N=26)	Social agen-cies (N=166)	Other (N=11)
Part Day	72%	36%	54%	100%	86%	54%	88%	67%	73%
Part Week	61	27	61	71	72	82	27	72	64
Steady Work	28	64	46	100	47	62	69	49	73
Intermittent Work	72	55	32	57	42	31	50	34	27
Some Jobs	78	45	82	100	78	72	88	75	91
All Jobs	0	0	14	0	3	8	0	8	0

N= the number of employers in each public sector category who reported recent experience hiring part-time women workers.

Size of Payroll

Short Work-Day: Size of payroll gives some indication of how the decision to use the short-day is made. As shown on Table 10, the very largest Private Sector employers use this arrangement at a markedly higher level than any other group, 86% as opposed to from 50% to 70% in other size categories. In the Public Sector the largest employers also use part-day arrangements at higher rates than any other size group, 73% as opposed to 60% to 67% among other size groups. See Table 11.

Short Work-Week When the data regarding current usage of the short work-week is studied, by size of payroll, the picture is different. In the Private Sector from 63% to 66% of the employers of the 50-to-299 work group and the larger employers, those with more-than-500 employees, report more short-week arrangements than other groups. In the Public Sector 79% of the employers of the 50-to-299 workers report hiring for the short work-week, the range of other size groups being from 60% to 73%. It should be noted that, while the large employers in the Public Sector do not report hiring on a part-week basis at highest levels, as in the Private Sector, nevertheless, the ranges of short work-week hiring which they report are higher than in the Private Sector. See Tables 10 and 11.

County Differences, Short-Day and Week

Both Philadelphia and Camden County employers report part-day employment at lower rates than any of their suburban counties. Sixty-one per cent of Philadelphia employers and 52% of Camden employers report hiring for the short-day, while all the suburban counties, both in the Pennsylvania portion of the SMSA and in the Camden Labor Area, report such practice with a range of 62% to 77%.

TABLE 10

NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS IN USAGE, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PRIVATE SECTOR

Non-Standard Work Arrangement	Size of Payroll					
	1-24 (N=79)	25-49 (N=40)	50-299 (N=87)	300-499 (N=26)	500-999 (N=31)	1,000 and over (N=35)
Part Day	60%	70%	67%	50%	58%	86%
Part Week	58	43	63	42	65	66
Steady Work	46	45	44	31	52	46
Intermittent Work	34	25	37	27	45	63
Some Jobs	34	45	67	69	65	77
All Jobs	14	10	17	0	13	20

Percentages are based on the number of employers in each size category who reported recent experience in the employment of part-time women workers.

TABLE 11

NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS IN USAGE, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL
PUBLIC SECTOR

Non-Standard Work Arrangement	Size of Payroll					
	1-24 (N=125)	25-49 (N=82)	50-299 (N=175)	300-499 (N=36)	500-999 (N=40)	1,000 and over (N=41)
Part Day	67%	60%	60%	67%	65%	73%
Part Week	60	71	79	72	70	73
Steady Work	50	51	58	58	58	68
Intermittent Work	42	28	35	31	48	34
Some Jobs	70	72	78	72	78	88
All Jobs	7	7	9	8	5	2

Percentages are based on the number of employers in each size category who reported recent experience in hiring of women workers.

However, Philadelphia employers (72%) are among the more frequent employers by the short-week, while Camden County is mid-range, 62% of her employers reporting they hire for the short-week. See Table 12.

Extensiveness of Part-time Job Categories

Since it is often claimed that only the most menial and generally unsatisfactory employment is open to part-time workers, some effort was made to learn whether employers are restricting their hiring of part-time workers to just a few job categories or whether all job categories were open to non-standard arrangements. Because of space considerations the options presented were too crude for definite conclusions to be drawn from the responses. Possibly many employers did not respond to these options because of some ambiguity in wording.[1]

As may be seen on Table 6, 544 SMSA employers (68%) who responded to the question reported that they hire women part-time workers for "some jobs" only. Seventy-seven (10%) reported that "all jobs" were open to employees working non-standard hours.

Public versus Private

As shown on Table 7, Public Sector employers appear to be much more restrictive than Private in their hiring practices concerning the extent to which job categories are open to part-time workers. Three-quarters of the Public Sector employers specified that only "some jobs" are open to part-time workers while only 56% of Private Sector employers so stated. This more liberal Private Sector

---

[1] Respondents may have been puzzled as to whether "some jobs" and "all jobs" referred to all jobs in the plant or just at the entry level.

TABLE 12

NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS IN USAGE, BY COUNTY

Non-Standard Work Arrangement	Pennsylvania Counties					Camden Labor Area		
	Phila-delphia (N=304)	Bucks (N= 59)	Chester (N=75)	Dela-ware (N= 79)	Mont-gomery (N= 152)	Camden (N= 52)	Burling-ton (N=36)	Glou-cester (N=40)
Part Day	61%	76%	67%	77%	62%	52%	64%	68%
Part Week	72	58	61	68	60	62	72	65
Steady Work	50	53	53	63	47	50	50	48
Intermittent Work	39	27	29	41	45	29	39	43
Some Jobs	69	64	72	80	70	52	50	68
All Jobs	8	15	12	11	9	4	17	13

position is affirmed by the nature of response to the query as to whether "all jobs" are open to such employment. While the response was very limited, about 13% of Private employers, this is almost double the 7% response of the Public Sector.

Private Sector Employer

Of the 40 employers in the Private Sector who specified all their job categories are open to part-time workers, most came from the Trade field. Over one-quarter of all Tradespeople who reported recent experience in hiring part-time workers say that all job categories are open to part-timers. Otherwise the range runs from 4% in the Finance-and-insurance institutions to 15% in the Apparel industry. No ready explanation appears to explain why some industries are more liberal in the extent of this hiring throughout the job category structure than others. See Table 8.

Public Sector

Of the 37 employers in the Public Sector who report "all jobs" open to part-time arrangements, the largest number, 32, come from Health agencies-and-institutions and the Social agencies. However, proportionally, a higher proportion of County employers (14%) reported "all jobs" open. Aside from these three groups, only one College reported an instance of all job categories being open. Almost 10% of the Health agencies-and-institutions, as mentioned above, and about 8% of the Social agencies so reported. The only conclusion which can be drawn from the small number of responses offered by only 4 of the 9 Public Sector employer groups studied is that the Public Sector views part-time employment as being very much limited in scope to certain types of employment. See Table 9.

The data shown on tables included in this section dealing with reportage of non-standard arrangements according to duration or continuity of employment (steady versus intermittent work) will be discussed in Chapter V.

Size of Payroll

Size of employer is helpful in explaining employer policies in regard to restricting part-time hiring to limited job categories in the plant.

There is a strong association to size shown in both Private and Public Sectors. In the Private Sector 34% of the smallest employers report restrictions while 77% of the largest do so. Public Sector employers in all size categories are much more likely to hire workers in restricted categories only than the Private Sector. Seventy per cent of the smallest Public Sector employers and 88% of the largest report only "some" job categories filled by part-timers. See Tables 10 and 11. The conclusion must be that large employers restrict their hiring to a limited number of job categories more frequently than smaller employers.

When the opposite hiring is studied by size of employer i.e., employer tendency to hire part-timers for "all" job categories, there are no consistent trends according to size. In the Public Sector the employers, when they reach the 500 employee level, appear to begin dropping their already very modest willingness to hire part-timers for "all" job categories. Only 5% of the employers of 500-to-999 workers report doing so, while only 2% of 1,000-workers-or-more do so. Other size groups vary from a little over 7% to 9% in such reportage.

While there is no consistent pattern of relationship in the Private Sector between size and open-ness of all job categories to part-timers, 20% of the largest employers who have had recent experience in hiring part-timers reported such a policy. This exceeds the reportage of any other group, but not much more. About 17% of the employers of 50-to-299 workers reported such a policy. The range of other groups is from zero to 14%. See Tables 10 and 11.

The conclusion may be drawn that the larger the employer, the more willing he is to restrict his employment to certain types of employment for his female part-time workers. The range of difference in policy, according to size, is far greater among Private Sector groups than in the Public Sector. The Public Sector is far more conservatime than the Private, with much less variation in restrictive policies according to size.

In the Public Sector, of the few employers having a more liberal hiring policy, proportions drop off sharply as the largest size categories are examined. In the Private Sector, again, there is a much higher proportion of employers reporting more part-time employment throughout the job categories than in the Public Sector. Although the largest Private Sector employers may report more restriction in hiring, the very largest employer group, those of 1,000-or-more employees, also report proportionally more employers whose hiring policies include hiring part-time workers throughout the job categories than other groups.

Response by County

Employers in the hub counties of Philadelphia and Camden report restriction of employment of part-timers mid-range and low-level in regard to other counties. See Table 12. However, of the few employers who report opening up all job categories to part-time employment, fewer employers, come from Philadelphia and Camden Counties than any other, 8% and 4%, respectively; from 9% to 17% of other employers, by County, so reporting.

Summary

Recent Experience with Part-time Hiring of Women.

Seventy per cent of the respondents to this survey report recent part-time hiring experience in regard to women workers. While differences between Private and Public Sectors are not large, differences among Private and Public Sector groups are considerable. Tradespeople report part-time hiring most frequently, while Textilers are the least likely to be using this practice. According to reportage of this industry, 68% of the respondent Manufacturers, long believed resistant to part-time hiring, reported recent experience. In the Public Sector the public service group reported part-time hiring more frequently than public administration.

Size of payroll is not very helpful in explaining where part-time workers are to be found. However, in both Sectors of the economy the smallest employers report part-time hiring less frequently than larger.

Location of facility appears to bear on the extent of part-time hiring. Employers in the Pennsylvania portion of the SMSA report part-time hiring more frequently than employers in the New Jersey portion. Pennsylvania employers in the suburban counties of Philadelphia report recent experience in part-time hiring more frequently than do Philadelphia employers. Employers in the New Jersey satellite counties of Camden report such experience more frequently than do Camden County employers.

Greater Philadelphia employers report usage of part-day and part-week arrangements at almost equal rates; more steady part-time employment is reported than intermittent, about 51% to 37%. About two-thirds of the respondents with recent part-time hiring experience indicate they restrict part-time hiring to only some job categories. About 10% say they accept part-time workers in all job categories.

About half of the experienced part-time employers use a combination of part-day and part-week arrangements. Private Sector employers favor the short work-day over the short-week while Public Sector employers indicate the converse pattern. In fact, preferences for the short-day are about equal, with the Public Sector even more interested in the short-week. Considerable differences exist among the practices of the various industrial groups, no ready explanation appearing. While most industrial groups report more part-day hiring than week, Textiles and Manufacturing are the exceptions, reporting about equal division of hiring pattern. Industrial groups who most frequently report hiring by both the short-day and week are those who are, by their own report, the most frequent hirers of women part-time workers. In the Public Sector most employer groups also report preference for the short-day over the short-week, the exceptions being the Health agencies-and-institutions, the Social agencies and County employers.

Size of payroll influences the decision to use part-day arrangements, with the largest employers in both Sectors using this arrangement at higher levels than other groups. This is especially true in the Private Sector. The short work-week is reported most in usage in both Sectors by small-to-medium large employers, those with 50-to-299 workers.

Location of facility appears to also have a bearing on practices in usage. Both Philadelphia and Camden County employers report part-day employment at lower rates than any of their suburban counties. However, Philadelphia employers are among the more frequent users of the short-week while Camden is mid-range.

As noted above, most employers limit their part-time hiring to only certain job categories. The Public Sector, in this regard, is more restrictive than the Private Sector. In the Private Sector the Tradespeople report more hiring for all job categories than any other group. In the Public Sector it is the County employers, Health agencies-and-institutions, and Social agencies who report lack of restriction most frequently.

Size of payroll is helpful in explaining employer policies in regard to restricting part-time employment to only certain job categories. There is a strong association between size in both Sectors. In both Sectors, the smaller employers seem more willing to consider opening all job categories to part-time workers than larger employers.

Fewer employers in Philadelphia and Camden Counties report all job categories open to employees than in the suburban counties of the SMSA. A summary on stability of employment, as developed in part from the data presented in this Chapter, is included in Chapter V.

Abbreviated Shifts in Usage

Since little is known about shifts which are being used, especially abbreviated shifts in usage, employers were asked to identify the shifts which they are using in their businesses, plants, agencies or institutions. The purpose was, first, to increase knowledge as to what parts of the 24-hour potential work period are being utilized by employers, and, second, to lay a foundation for possible planning for future such employment for women heads-of-households in the future, should this appear to be a socially desirable goal.

The respondent employers' reports of the shifts they are now using are shown on Table 13. As might have been expected, the largest response of employers was to the most general possibility, "fewer hours during the work day." Three hundred forty-seven (44% of the 797 employers who reported having some recent experience hiring women workers on a part-time basis) indicated they have women workers on the basis of such a shift.

TABLE 13

ABBREVIATED SHIFTS IN USAGE

Type of Shift	Percentage of Response (N=797)
Fewer Hours during the Work Day....................	44%
Regular Afternoon Period only..	36
Regular Morning Period only....	31
Shorter Shifts at Night........	17
Short Shift after Regular Shift......................	13
Short Shift before Regular Shift......................	4
Two Women Sharing One Job......	17
Other..........................	11

Percentages are based on the number of employers who stated they had had recent experience hiring women on a part-time basis, 797.

Employers responded heavily to the specific shift designated "regular morning period only" and "regular afternoon period only" as shown on Table 13. The afternoon shift appears to be somewhat more popular than the morning one among respondent employers. Thirty-one per cent of the employers indicated that they use the "morning only" short shift, while 30% said they use the "afternoon only" shift. One hundred thirty-seven employers (17%) said they have "shorter shifts at night." One hundred four (13%) said they use a short shift "after the regular shift" while only 34 (4%) indicated they used an early morning shift "before the regular shift."

It appears that the two-women-sharing-one-job concept has yet to catch on; only 134 employers (17%) reported such situations. Eleven per cent of the employers indicated that other, non-specified arrangements are in practice.

Public versus Private

In viewing usage of short shifts by the two Sectors of the economy, it appears that there are differences in practice between the two Sectors. As shown on Table 14, the Public Sector uses a morning shift more frequently than does the Private Sector, 35% to 25%. The Private Sector

TABLE 14

ABBREVIATED SHIFTS IN USAGE, BY TYPE OF EMPLOYER

Type of Shift	Percentage of Return	
	Private Sector (N=298)	Public Sector (N=499)
Fewer Hours during the Work Day...............	44%	43%
Regular Morning Period only...................	25	35
Regular Afternoon Period only.................	35	37
Shorter Shifts at Night...	25	12
Short Shift before Regular Shift..........	6	3
Short Shift after Regular Shift..........	17	11
Two Women Sharing One Job.	12	19
Other.....................	10	11

Percentages are based on the number of employers who reported recent experience in hiring women workers part-time.

uses shorter shifts at night at double the rate of the Public Sector, 25% to 12%. More specifically, the Private Sector uses the short shift "after the regular shift" at a much higher rate than the Public, about 17% to 11%. The Private Sector also reports usage of the not-very-popular short shift "before the regular shift" at a higher rate than the Public Sector, 6% to 3%.

The Public Sector is considerably ahead of the Private in usage of the two-women-sharing-one-job concept, 19% to 12%.

Type of Industry

Fewer Hours During the Work Day

The industrial groups reporting heaviest usage of the most popular short shift "fewer hours during the work day," are the Apparel industry (69%), Paper-and-printing (73%), Finance-and-insurance institutions (54%), the Chemical-and-allied group (46%), and Trade (43%). See Table 15. These industries include the big, middle-range, and low-level users of part-time help.

Afternoon Only Shifts

The second most popularly designated shift arrangement, the more specific "afternoon shift only," is most used by the Food-processors (53%), the Tradespeople (46%), the Chemical-and-allied industries (38%), the Finance-and-insurance institutions (34%) and the Apparel industry (31%). All levels of users are included.

Morning Only Shifts

The "morning period only" shift, which is used by about 25% of the employers reporting recent experience with part-time hiring, seems popular with those industrial groups

TABLE 15

ABBREVIATED SHIFTS IN USAGE, BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY

Type of Shift	Type of Industry								
	Apparel (N=26)	Chemical and allied ind. (N=13)	Finance and ins. (N=50)	Food processing (N=19)	Manufacturing (N=43)	Paper and printing (N=11)	Services (N=40)	Textiles (N= 12)	Trade (N= 84)
Fewer Hours During Work Day	69%	46%	54%	11%	40%	73%	35%	17%	43%
Regular Morning Period Only	19	38	16	37	23	36	25	25	25
Regular Afternoon Period Only	31	38	34	53	16	27	30	8	46
Shorter Shifts at Night	8	23	26	26	14	45	15	8	40
Shorter Shifts Before Regular Shifts	4	0	4	0	2	0	8	0	12
Shorter Shifts After Regular Shifts	4	0	20	16	23	27	5	0	25
Two Women Sharing One Job	15	0	16	11	2	18	5	0	20
Other	8	0	8	16	17	9	5	8	15

Percentages are based on number of employers in each category reporting recent experience hiring part-time women workers.

which are among the middle-range hirers of women part-timers; also a low-level hirer. About 38% of the Chemical-and-allied industries group, 37% of the Food-processors, and 36% of the Paper-and-printing industry reports use of this shift. A quarter of the Textilers, Tradespeople, and Services report using the "morning only" shift, the Textilers being low users of women part-timers, and the other two groups in the upper and mid-range (see Table 1 in Appendix A for ranking of usage of part-time help by industry). Those groups who use the "morning only" shift the least, Apparel (19%), Manufacturing (23%), Finance-and-insurance institutions (16%) include both the high and middle-range users of part-time women workers.

Night Shifts

About one-quarter of all Private Sector employers who use short-shifts use some form of short-shift at night. The level of usage, by industry, varies greatly. The Paper-and-printing industry (45%) and the Tradespeople (40%) are the biggest users. The Finance-and-insurance institutions (26%), Food-processors (26%), and Chemical-and-allied industries (23%) are middle-range users of form of night arrangement. Manufacturers (14%), Textilers (8%), and the Apparel industry (8%) are the industrial groups least disposed to use some form of short night shift.

It appears that the larger users of female part-time workers are more apt to use some form of night shift than low-level users. The two largest users of some form of short night shift include a big user of female part-time help, Trade, and a middle-range user, the Paper-and-printing industry. The middle-range users of short night shifts include big(Finance, et.al.), middle-range (Food-processors) and low (Chemical-and-allied industries) level users of female part-time help. The industrial groups reporting use of some form of short night shift least often are a middle-range user of female part-time help (Manufacturers) and two low-level users of female part-timers (Textilers and the Apparel industry).

The specific night shifts designated in the survey instrument were "short shift after the regular shift" and "short shift before the regular shift." The former is of much greater interest to industry than the latter. Fifty employers, about 17% of all employers reporting some recent part-time hiring, reported using the "short shift after the regular shift." It is most popular in Paper-and-printing (27%), in Trade (25%), in Manufacturing (23%), and in Finance-and-insurance institutions (20%), all large or middle-range users of part-time workers. Still among the users, those groups reporting least usage are the Food-processors (16%), the Services (5%), and Apparel (4%). This shift is not reported at all in Textiles or the Chemical-and-allied industries groups.

The "short shift before the regular shift" is seldom used. Only 17 Private Sector employers reported it, 10 of them in the Trade field. Three employers in the Services, 2 in Finance, and 1 each in Apparel and Manufacturing also use it. It appears this least popular shift is almost exclusively used by the heavy users of part-time workers.

Other Shifts

Other short shift arrangements are in usage which are not covered by the above-designated descriptions. Thirty-one employers in the Private Sector, about 10% of the employers reporting recent experience in the hiring of women part-timers, indicated other arrangements than those presented. Thirteen of these "other" types of short shifts are in Trade, 5 in Manufacturing, and 4 in Finance, and 3 in Food-processing.

Two-Women-One-Job

Despite the public attention aroused by the news media in regard to the need for new work arrangements for women, only 3 industrial groups report as many as 4 of its members engaging in this practice. Of the 37 Private Sector employers who report such an arrangement, 13 are in Trade, 8 in Finance-and-insurance institutions, and 4 in Apparel. See Table 15 for the scattering of the remainder. It appears that the two industries most willing to consider the two-woman-one-job concept are fields heavily female as well as heavy users of part-time help.

Type of Public Sector Employer

Fewer Hours During Work Day

More Public Sector employers report they hire part-time women workers "fewer hours in the work day" than any other arrangement. See Table 16. The employers reporting most use of this broadly designated arrangement are the Schools (65%), Colleges-and-universities (64%), and the Federal agencies (61%). Middle-range users are the Social agencies (43%). Municipal employers (43%), County employers (39%), and Health agencies-and-institutions (38%). The Public Sector employers reporting least use of this broadly-stated arrangement are the State agencies (27%) and the group identified as "Other" (27%). Of course, purely numerically, most of the reportage comes from the Health agencies-and-institutions and Social agencies, since these two groups responded to the survey at very high rates. There is no relationship discernable between the tendency to use this shift arrangement and the extent to which the employer group engages in part-time hiring.

TABLE 16

ABBREVIATED SHIFTS IN USAGE, BY TYPE OF PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Type of Shift	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Federal (N=18)	State (N=11)	County (N=28)	Municipal (N=7)	Colleges and universities (N=36)	Health agencies and inst. (N=196)	Schools (N=26)	Social agencies (N=166)	Other (N=11)
Fewer Hours During Work Day	61%	27%	39%	43%	64%	38%	65%	43%	27%
Regular Morning Period Only	33	0	18	43	39	29	54	45	36
Regular Afternoon Period Only	39	9	21	43	36	33	42	44	64
Short Shifts at Night	6	0	14	14	6	19	12	8	9
Short Shift Before Regular Shift	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4	0
Short Shift After Regular Shift	6	9	11	0	11	16	12	6	0
Two Women Sharing One Job	0	9	18	14	6	21	12	23	0
Other	11	11	32	0	11	9	8	11	9

Percentages are based on the number of employees in each category who reported recent experience hiring part-time women workers.

"Afternoon Only" Shifts

Among Public Sector employers as well as Private, the "afternoon only" shift is the most popular specifically identified short-shift arrangement. One hundred eighty-five employers, 37% of the Public Sector employers experienced in recent hiring of part-time women workers, report using this shift. A small group of employers designated as "other" use the afternoon shift at far higher rates than any other, 64%.

In general, from 33% to 43% of the Public Sector employers reporting using this shift: the Social agencies (43%), the Municipal agencies (43%), Schools 43%), Federal agencies (39%), Colleges-and-universities (36%), and Health agencies-and-institutions (33%). Least reportage of use of this shift came from the County employers (21%), and the State agencies (9%). Again, there is no pattern of relationship between an industry's tendency to use this shift and the rate at which it engages in part-time hiring.

"Morning Only" Shifts

The second most popular, specifically identified short shift is the "morning only" shift. Over one-third of the Public Sector employers who report recent experience in hiring of part-timers say they use this shift. 177 employers. The Schools (some of which are school systems) report the highest level of usage of this shift, 54%. Most of the users report from 29% to about 45% of their groups using this shift, the Social agencies (45%), the Municipal agencies (43%), the Colleges 39%), the "Others" (36%), the Federal agencies (33%), and the Health agencies-and-institutions (29%). The Public Sector employer reporting least usage was the County group (18%), while State agencies failed to report any use of such a shift at all.

Night Shifts

Sixty-two Public Sector employers reported that they use some form of short night-shift, 12% of all employers in the Public Sector who recently have had hired women on a part-time basis. The most frequent users of the not very-popular-night-time arrangement are the Health agencies-and-institutions (19%), the Municipal agencies (14%), and County employers (14%). Middle-range users are the Schools (12%), "Others" (9%), and Social agencies (8%). Colleges-and-universities (6%) and Federal employers (6%) are the least frequent users who reported on this shift. No State employers at all volunteered information in regard to this broadly-designated night arrangement. As will be seen, one State agency reported on a more specific evening arrangement. No obvious explanation appears to explain why some Public Sector groups use night arrangements. Clearly institutional-type employers need more night-time help than administrative-type employers, but since some Federal, State, County, and Municipal employers are institutions offering 24-hour service, it is impossible to offer an explanation of rates of usage of night shifts on the basis of the limitations of the data.

When night shift arrangements were more specifically designated as "short shift after the regular shift" and "short shift before the regular shift," 54 (11%) of the Public Sector employers indicated that they use the "short shift after the regular shift," while 17 (3%) said they use the "short shift before the regular shift."

Only 7 of the 9 groups of Public Sector employers reported use of the short night shift after the regular shift. Thirty-two of the 54 reporting employers are in the Health field, while 10 are in Social agencies. Several Schools, Colleges-and-universities, and County employers each reported such usage. In regard to use of this specific night shift, Health institutions would need such a shift for 24-hour coverage while Social agencies often have early evening hours, often for recreational, educational, or treatement purposes.

Even less popular than the night shift discussed above is the night shift just before the standard daily shift. Only 3 employer groups reported usage of this shift, 10 in the Health field (5%), 6 in Social agencies (6%), and 1 in Schools (12%). It may be speculated that maintenance work is done in the very early hours of the morning in Health institutions and in Schools. No obvious explanation presents itself for Social agency usage of this rare shift.

Other Shifts

As in the Private Sector, the above shift descriptions did not cover all the short shift arrangements in usage among the employer groups solicited. Fifty-seven Public Sector employers indicated they had "Other" arrangements in usage (11%). Nineteen of these "Other" arrangements are in Social agencies (11%), 18 are in the Health field (9%), and 9 are in the County agencies (32%). Four are in the Colleges-and-universities (11%).

Two-Women-Sharing-One-Job

While it can not be said that the two-women-sharing-one-job concept has taken hold in the Public Sector to any great extent, the usage exists at a higher level than in the Private Sector, according to reports received in this survey. Ninety-seven employers (19%) reported they engage in this practice. Forty-three are in the Health field (21%) and 39 in the Social agencies (23%). Five each are to be found among County employers (18%) and in the Colleges-and-universities (6%). Therefore it must be seen that most of the job-sharing which is being done is in a fifth to a quarter of the Health agencies-and-institutions and the Social agencies.

Size of Payroll

In the over-all data there are positive associations between size of payroll and the level of employer usage of some shifts. This sometimes holds up only in one sector of the economy. See Tables 17 and 18.

Fewer Hours During the Work Day

In the case of employer reportage of the most generally identified short shift, "fewer hours during the work day," there is a positive association between size of payroll and level of employer response. About 32% of the smallest employers report use of this shift, while over half of the largest employers so report. When controlled for type of employer, in the Public Sector about one-third of the smallest employers use this shift, while about 54% of the largest employers use it. In addition, two-thirds of the employers of the next largest size category use this shift, making the contrast with the smallest group more marked. In Private Sector there is no such relationship.

Morning and Afternoon Shifts

In considering the data in regard to the popular afternoon and morning shifts, there are no patterns of relationship between size and frequency of usage. Considering the case of the afternoon shift, while there is no consistent relationship to size in the data, in both the Private and Public Sectors the largest size category of employer reports the most frequent usage, 49% in the Private Sector and 51% in the Public Sector.

In the case of the morning shift, there is also no

TABLE 17

ABBREVIATED SHIFTS IN USAGE, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PRIVATE SECTOR

Type of Shift	Size of Payroll					
	1-24 (N=79)	25-49 (N=40)	50-299 (N=87)	300-499 (N=26)	500-999 (N=31)	1,000 and over (N=35)
Fewer Hours During Work Week	29%	63%	44%	54%	45%	49%
Regular Morning Period Only	15	30	28	19	26	34
Regular Afternoon Period Only	29	35	35	23	42	49
Shorter Shifts at Night	20	13	24	23	45	37
Short Shift Before Regular Shift	3	8	5	0	10	11
Short Shift After Regular Shift	9	13	16	4	26	43
Two Women Sharing One Job	14	8	14	4	6	23
Other	9	15	8	12	13	11

Percentages are based on the number of private sector employers in each size category who reported recent experience hiring women workers part-time.

TABLE 18

ABBREVIATED SHIFTS IN USAGE, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PUBLIC SECTOR

Type of Shift	Size of Payroll					
	1-24 (N=125)	25-49 (N=82)	50-299 (N=175)	300-499 (N=36)	500-999 (N=40)	1,000 and over (N=41)
Fewer Hours During Work Day	34%	40%	43%	47%	68%	54%
Regular Morning Period Only	38	41	30	33	28	49
Regular Afternoon Period Only	31	40	37	39	33	51
Shorter Shifts at Night	12	9	9	28	10	27
Short Shift Before Regular Shift	27	7	3	0	3	5
Short Shift After Regular Shift	10	10	7	22	10	22
Two Women Sharing One Job	22	21	17	22	18	20
Other	11	15	11	8	10	10

Percentages are based on the number of private sector employers in each size category who reported recent experience hiring women workers part-time.

consistent pattern of relationship between size and usage. Again, in both Private and Public Sectors, the largest employers report the most frequent usage, 34% and 49%, respectively. In the Private Sector, the smallest employers report usage at a lower level than other groups, 15%.

Night Shifts

Size appears to make an important difference in employer's decision to use "shorter shifts at night" or not. In the overall data the employers of 300-or-more employees report using such a shift at much higher rates than smaller employers. About 10% to 15% of the employers in the less-than-300 size categories report using this very boradly designated night shift, while 25% to 32% of the employers of 300-or-more workers report such usage. In the Private Sector the breaking point for increased usage is the 500-employee mark. In smaller size categories, 13% to 24% of the employers say they use "shorter shifts at night," while 37% to 45% of the employers of 500-or-more workers so report. In the Public Sector, the trend follows the overall data more in that the groups reporting usage least often are concentrated in the below-300 employess group. About 27% of the 300-to-499 employer group and the employers of 1,000-workers-or-more report using such a shift. Curiously, only 10% of the 500-to-999 worker group of employers report using this type of shift.

When night shift users were presented with more specific designations, they indicated a positive association between use of the short shift "after the regular shift" and size. The smallest users do so at the rate of 9%, while 32% of the largest size category of employers report such usage. There appears to be a big difference between the liklihood of most employers to use such a shift and those who have 1,000-or-more employees i.e., there is a step function. While there is a small but steady rise in usage up through the size categories, the rate of usage jumps from 17% among the employers of 500-to-999 employers, while the largest employers report the previously mentioned 32% rate of usage.

While the data are controlled for types of employer, in the Private Sector there is no longer any pattern of relationship according to size, but markedly more such usage in the two largest size groups than in any other, almost 26% in the 500-to-999 employee group and about 43% among the very largest employers. In the Public Sector, there is considerably more usage where the employer has 300-or-more employees. About 22% of the employers of 300-to-499 workers and the very largest such employers report such usage. Curiously, the employers of 500-to-999 workers are more in line with the smaller employers, only 10% reporting use of this shift.

There is no pattern of relationship between size and usage of the night shift before the regular shift. In the overall data the largest employers report the most usage of this unpopular shift, 8%. In the Private Sector the two largest size groups of employers use this shift much more frequently than others, about 10% of the employers of 500-to-999 workers use it, while over 11% of the largest employers do. In the Public Sector there is no pattern of usage related to size.

"Other" Shifts

There is no pattern of relationship between size and reportage of shifts not identified above.

Two-Women-Sharing-One-Job

There is no consistent pattern of relationship between reportage of use of this arrangement and size of employer. In the overall data the largest employers report slightly more usage than the smallest employers, about 21% to 19%, respectively, other size groups reporting at lesser levels. In the Private Sector there is markedly more such employment among the largest employers than anywhere else. Twenty-three per cent of the largest employers report such experience, while only 4% to 14% of employers in other size categories reported such experience. In the Public Sector there are no consistent patterns or striking observations.

County Usage

No trends or observations of interest could be determined when the data concerning usage of the various shifts was examined by County.

Summary

Greater Philadelphia employers report more usage of a general-type of shift arrangement labeled "fewer hours during the work day" than any other arrangement. Of more specifically designated shifts, more interest was expressed in an "after only" shift than a "morning only" shift. SMSA employers use short daytime shifts much more frequently than night. Of the two specifically designated night shifts, much more interest was expressed in the short shift "after the regular shift" than an early morning shift "before the regular shift." Only about 17% of all employers with recent experience hiring women on a part-time basis report the two-women-one-job concept is being practiced in their establishment.

There are differences in patterns of usage of the various shifts by type of employer. Public Sector employers are more frequent users of a "morning only" shift and the two-women-one-job concept. The Private Sector more frequently uses "afternoon only" shifts and night shifts than the Public Sector.

The industrial groups using the most popular shift, "fewer hours during the work day" and the "afternoon only" shift include some of the heaviest hirers of part-time workers. The "morning only" shift seems popular with industrial groups who are the lesser employers of part-time workers.

In the Public Sector there is no clear division between the public administration and public service groups in regard to the shifts most frequently used. No criterion was found to explain why particular Public Sector employers are especially heavy users of particular shifts. A small group identified as "Other" uses the afternoon shift more often: Schools use the morning shift more ferquently than any other group. Most of the Public Sector employers using night shifts are in the Health field. Other more frequent users are Social agencies and two-women-one-job concept are either in the Health or Social agencies.

Size is more important in explaining employer usage of particular shifts than type of employer. In regard to the most popular shift, "fewer hours during the work day," there is a positive association to size in the overall data and in the Public Sector. In the usage of the "morning only" shift, it is found that the largest employers in both Public and Private Sectors use it more than any other size group. In the Private Sector, the smallest employers are the least frequent users. The popular "afternoon only" shift is most often used by the largest employers in both Private and Public Sectors.

In regard to usage of night shifts, larger employers are most prone to be using some type of night arrangement. In the Public Sector, employers of 300-or-more workers reported more usage of "shorter shifts at night" than smaller employers. In the Private Sector, the breaking point was the 500-worker size. The same pattern is evident in usage of the "short shift after the regular shift." In regard to the little-used "short shift before the regular shift," in the Private Sector, the employers of more-than-500 workers report the most usage. There are no observations of interest in the Public Sector.

Size does not appear to be very important in the decision whether to permit women to share jobs. In general the largest employers are slightly bigger users than other groups. This is slightly more so in the Private Sector when the data are controlled for type of employer.

County of location is not helpful in explaining employer usage of particular shifts.

Possible Non-Standard Work Arrangements

This section deals with new arrangements for part-time employment that respondent employers might be willing to implement for women workers.

Although 684 employers (62%) of all 1,110 respondent employers to this survey volunteered early in the questionnaire that they could make some additional part-time employment available to minimally-skilled women beyond their current hiring levels, the data on willingness to consider specific steps indicate once more the abundance of good intentions over concrete demonstration. When asked to specify what types of non-standard arrangements they might be willing to consider, only 103 employers specified new part-day arrangements they might be willing to implement; only 118 specified new part-week arrangements, some overlap occurring between the two bodies of response. This may be too pessimistic an observation in view of the large number of employers, 476, or 40% of the 1,110 respondents, who responded to another individually posed question by saying they would consider the possibility of hiring women for non-standard week arrangements (if they do not already do so). This leads to the speculation that the major data on employer willingness to consider new work arrangements represent under-statement.

As explained in an earlier section concerning non-standard work arrangements in usage, the form in which this material was requested appears to be responsible for the low rate of response. In the case of the material disucssed in this section (possible non-standard arrangements), the problem of question-form was an even more important factor since employers were asked to go over a series of question-options a second time, underlining what they had previously been asked to circle (where pertinent).

Although a low rate of response was obtained, the data are being presented in the belief that it is valid, but most probably represents understatement. It is believed that the trends are similar to those revealed in analysis of the non-standard patterns of work arrangements presently in usage, as presented earlier in this chapter.

In this section employer responses concerning possible new non-standards in relation to scheduling and the extent to which possible job categories in the establishment are included will be discussed. Responses concerning the degree of willingness to consider new arrangements of a stable-type, arrangements providing for continuity of employment are discussed in the following chapter which concerns itself exclusively with stability of employment.

As may be seen on Table 19, employers who are thinking in terms of new non-standard arrangements parallel present users by being more interested in short-week arrangements than part-day (in the overall data) and in restricting non-standard arrangements to only some job categories.

TABLE 19

EMPLOYER OPINIONS OF POSSIBLE NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS

Type of Arrangement	Percentage of Response (N=1,110)
Part-Day...........................	9%
Part-Week..........................	11
Steady Work........................	9
Intermittent Work..................	14
Some Jobs..........................	14
All Jobs...........................	3

Percentages are based on all respondents to the survey since both experienced and present non-hirers might consider new arrangements for women workers.

Specifically about 10% of the 1,110 respondents to the survey are willing to consider new short-day or short-week arrangements. As might be anticipated, most employers who responded to the question are thinking in terms of opening up only certain job categories to part-time workers. One hundred fifty-five employers expressed willingness to consider opening up new arrangements limited to only certain job categories, while only 32 specified they might consider expanding part-time opportunities in all job categories.

Public versus Private

Public and Private Sector employers volunteered readiness to consider new non-standard arrangements at fairly similar rates. See Table 20. Relative interest in new short-day as opposed to possible short-week arrangements does not wholly follow the trends of relative preference in actual usage.

The Public Sector shows slightly less interest than the Private in new short-day arrangements. Nine per cent

TABLE 20

EMPLOYER OPINIONS ON POSSIBLE NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS, BY TYPE OF EMPLOYER

Type of Arrangement	Percentage of Response	
	Private Sector (N=438)	Public Sector (N=672)
Part-Day................	11%	9 %
Part-Week...............	12	10
Steady Work.............	10	8
Intermittent Work.......	16	13
Some Jobs...............	14	14
All Jobs................	4	2

of the Public Sector employers are willing to consider new part-day arrangements; 10% might consider new short-week arrangements. Private Sector employers are slightly more interested in both types of employment than Public employers; 11% for part-day; 12% for part-week. Curiously, while absolute numbers are very small, about double the percentage of Private Sector employers are willing to consider opening up all job categories to part-time arrangements as Public, 4% to 2%.

Type of Industry

New Short Day or Weekly Arrangements

At best, only about 16% of the 438 respondent Private employers expressed willingness to consider any type of abbreviated work schedules. The willingness of the various Private Sector industries which were studied to consider new short-day and short-week arrangements is reviewed below.

As may be seen from Table 21, the industrial groups most willing to consider new short-day arrangements, Manufacturers (18%), Trade (17%), and Finance-and-insurance

TABLE 21

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON POSSIBLE NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS, BY INDUSTRY

Non-Standard Work Arrangement	Type of Industry								
	Apparel (N=47)	Chemical and allied ind. (N=35)	Finance and ins. (N=61)	Food pro-cess-ing (N=28)	Manu-fac-tur-ing (N=63)	Paper and print-ing (N=20)	Serv-ices (N=53)	Tex-tiles (N=28)	Trade (N=97)
Part Day	9%	9%	12%	0%	18%	5%	8%	0%	17%
Part Week	2	3	13	7	21	5	13	7	17
Steady Work	13	9	7	0	13	15	6	7	14
Intermittent Work	9	17	18	0	21	20	13	21	12
Some Jobs	9	14	16	7	24	0	15	11	16
All Jobs	2	3	3	4	2	5	2	4	9

TABLE 22

EMPLOYER OPINIONS OF POSSIBLE NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS, BY PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Non-Standard Work Arrangement	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Fed-eral (N= 45)	State (N= 38)	County (N=53)	Muni-cipal (N= 18)	Colleges and univer-sities (N=39)	Health agencies and inst. (N=224)	Schools (N=31)	Social agen-cies (N= 210)	Other (N= 14)
Part Day	13%	5%	6%	17%	3%	8%	13%	9%	7%
Part Week	13	24	15	0	5	8	7	11	7
Steady Work	13	8	13	0	3	7	13	7	14
Intermittent Work	11	13	19	6	10	13	10	13	14
Some Jobs	22	18	23	17	3	12	19	12	7
All Jobs	0	3	0	0	3	3	0	2	7

(12%) are among the four largest present users of part-time help, as reported by themselves. See Table 1 in Appendix A.

Private Sector Employers

When willingness to consider new short-week arrangements is reviewed by type of industry, it may be noted that the industrial groups most willing to think in terms of possibly opening up new short-week arrangements are the four industrial groups already reporting themselves as the largest present employers of part-time workers, the Trade field, Finance-and-insurance, Services, and the Manufacturers. However, it is the Manufacturers, about 21% of them, who express the most willingness to consider new short-week shifts. Tradespeople follow with 17% indicating such willingness; about 13% each of the Finance-and-insurance institutions, and Services so indicating.

Extensiveness of Job Categories

Of those 63 employers who responded to the inquiry regarding the extent to which job categories might be opened to part-time arrangements, Manufacturers led the group by specifying that only "some" job categories would be open. Twenty-four per cent of all Manufacturers included in the survey responded to this question. Only Tradespeople (10%) are willing to seriously consider opening up all job categories to non-standard arrangements, as may be seen from Table 21.

Public Sector Employers

New Arrangements Part-Day or Week

The distribution of the 57 Public Sector employers who thought they might be able to hire some women non-standard working hours is shown on Table 22. As may be seen, two public administration groups, the Federal (13%) and the Municipal employers (17%) and Schools (most of which are public--13%) express the most interest in new arrangements by the day. The groups showing the most interest in new short-week arrangements are the State (24%), County (15%), and Federal employers (13%), all public administration.

Extensiveness of New Job Categories

A larger proportion of employers in public administration than in public service indicate some willingness to have at least "some" job categories open to part-time work arrangements. While the public administration group does not presently engage in much part-time hiring, all four groups gave evidence of a healthy interest in at least considering some jobs as open to such arrangements. They include the Federal employers (22%), the State agencies (18%), the County (23%), and the Municipal (17%). Only the Schools (20%) in the public service sector showed a higher level of interest.

Public Sector employer interest in part-time arrangements, for practical purposes, is limited to the possibility of opening up only certain job categories to part-timers. With one exception involving a negligible number of cases, less than 3% of any Public Sector employer group is willing to consider opening up all job categories to part-time workers. This is in contrast to the Private Sector where as many as 26% of the employers in one group expressed willingness to at least consider such a possibility. The reluctance of the Public Sector employers to open up the entire range of available job categories to part-timers is also in contrast to what some Public Sector employer groups say they already do. For example, about 14% of the County employers and 10% of the Social agencies reported that all job categories are open to part-time hiring arrangements at present.

Possible Abbreviated Shift Arrangements

An effort has been made in this study to learn more about the kinds of new short-shift arrangements employers might be willing to develop. This was done chiefly by asking employers to indicate the specific short-shift arrangement which they might be willing to consider. Five hundred thirty-four responses were received, about 38% of the number of responses received in regard to the short-shifts already in existence. Table 23 shows the distribution of employer preferences.

TABLE 23

POSSIBLE ABBREVIATED SHIFTS

Type of Shift	Percentage of Response (N=1,110)
Regular Morning Period Only....	10%
Regular Afternoon Period Only..	9
Fewer Hours during the Working Day.................	8
Short Shift after the Regular Shift...............	4
Shorter Shifts at Night........	3
Short Shift before the Regular Shift...............	2
Two-Women-Sharing-One-Job......	7
Other.........................	1

Percentages are based on the number of employers responding to the survey.

As may be noted from Table 23, potential short-shift employers are more interested in increasing the "regular morning period only," than any other and, second, in increasing the number of "afternoon only" shifts (9%). This is the reverse of the situation in actual usage where the overall data show the afternoon shift being used slightly more often than the morning shift period.

Size of Payroll

New Short-Day or Weekly Arrangements

Size of payroll is not a productive means by which to analyze employer willingness to consider new short-day or week arrangements. This holds when the data is controlled for type of employer.

Extensiveness of Job Categories

In the total data there is a direct association between size of payroll and employer inclination to restrict part-time employment to some job categories only. The range is very small, however, from about 12% of the smallest employers to about 17% of the largest. In the Private Sector, two of the three largest employer groups express far more inclination in this direction than any other size groups, about 22% indicating such inclination. Other groups express their inclinations on this issue from a range of 9% to 14%. In the Public Sector there is no evident pattern related to size or observations of particular interest.

When the willingness to consider opening up all job categories to part-time workers is considered, it is clear, both in the Public and Private Sectors, that the willingness to do so is concentrated among the employers of fewer-than-300 employees.

Stability of Employment

Employer readiness to offer new stable work arrangements as opposed to intermittent is discussed in Chapter V.

Summary

At best, only 15% of the Greater Philadelphia employers who responded to this survey expressed themselves in regard to new non-standard work arrangements they might be willing to contemplate. It is believed the data represent understatements in view of similar, more numerous responses secured from similar questions asked in other form. Basically, employers show more interest in new short-week arrangements than short-day and in continuing the present practice of restricting part-time openings to only limited job categories. There are not great differences in potential interests of the Public and Private Sectors.

The industrial groups most willing to consider new non-standard arrangements for the day or week tend to be those who currently are large or mid-range users of part-time workers. Of all the industrial groups, only Tradespeople expressed any amount of interest worthy of notice in opening up all job categories to part-time workers.

In the Public Sector the groups showing most interest in new short-day arrangements are all in the public administration group. Schools show the most interest in new short-week arrangements. With one exception, Public Sector groups show less than 3% interest in opening up all job categories to part-time workers.

Size of employer payroll does not appear to influence much the willingness to consider new non-standard work arrangements by the day or week. This holds when data are controlled for type of employer, Public Sector and Private. One observation of some interest is that smaller employers are more willing to consider opening up all job categories to part-time employers than larger ones.

Analysis by county of location is not very revealing. However, the observation may be made that the hub counties of Philadelphia and Camden are mid-range in most of their responses to suggested new non-standard work arrangements.

Ninety-two employers, about 8% of the total number of employers responding to the survey, opted for the very general designation of a short shift, "fewer hours during the work day," as one they might consider.

As in the actual situation in practice, interest in night shifts is far less than day arrangements; 38 employers (3%) specified they might consider some night arrangements; "short shift after the regular shift, 43 or 5%. Surprisingly 24 employers (2%) expressed interest in the currently little used "short shift before the regular shift."

Only 14 employers, 1%, expressed interest in "other" type of shift arrangement than the types of shifts presented.

A fair amount of interest was expressed in the two-women-one-job concept, with 82 employers (7%) indicating they may be willing to consider such an arrangement. While this may appear to be a small number, it represents a fairly substantial addition to the 134 employers who report already having two women fulfilling expectations for a full time job between them.

Public versus Private

Since the proportion of employers agreeing to consider additional short shifts is small in absolute terms, it can not be said that there are large absolute differences between Public and Private Sector interest in this subject. However, in a few cases the relative proportion of one sector is much more pronounced than the other. See Table 24.

The Private Sector indicates it is more interested in considering additional arrangements to hire women for "fewer hours during the work day" than the Private, about 10% to 7%. It is also more interested in considering more "afternoon only" (10% to 8%) shifts, and in more shifts

TABLE 24

POSSIBLE ABBREVIATED SHIFTS, BY TYPE OF EMPLOYER

Type of Shift	Percentage of Response	
	Private Sector (N=438)	Public Sector (N=672)
Fewer Hours During the Work Day................	10 %	7 %
Regular Morning Period Only....................	10	9
Regular Afternoon Period Only....................	10	8
Shorter Shifts at Night...	5	3
Short Shift before Regular Shift..........	2	2
Short Shift after Regular Shift..................	2	5
Two-Women-Sharing One-Job................	6	8
Other.....................	2	1

which were not adequately covered by the listings of shift offered in the questionnaire.

The data are not clear in relation to possible night shifts to be considered. The Private Sector indicates more interest in the more generally designated shift termed "shorter shifts at night," but the Public Sector indicates about double the interest in the two specifically identified night shifts, though only about 5% of the Private Sector employers, at best, are interested in introducing new night shifts.

The Public Sector is slightly more interested in expanding the two-women-one-job concept than the Private, 8% to 6%.

Type of Industry

Fewer Hours During the Work Day

From an examination of Table 25, it appears that the industries most interested in engaging in extending part-time hiring, using the most generally described short-shift as an example, "fewer hours during the work day," are those ranking presently as high and mid-level users of part-time help, the Manufacturers (18%) and the Services (17%). The level of interest of the majority of industrial groups in expanding this shift ranges from about 5% to 9%, a very small variation. This group includes the whole range of current users of this shift, the highest Trade (6%); the lowest current user, the Chemical-and-allied industries (9%); two mid-range users, the Apparel industry (9%) and Paper-and-printing (5%); and a current low user, Textiles (7%). The Food-processing industry, currently a mid-range user of part-time help registered no interest at all in this shift.[1]

Regular Morning Period and Regular Afternoon Periods Only

As noted earlier, there is slightly more interest among potential users in more new morning shifts than afternoon. In examining the data, as seen on Table 25, it appears that the industrial groups most interested in new morning shifts are also the ones most interested in new afternoon shifts. They are as follows:

---

[1] Note that percentages cited are related to the proportion of employers willing to consider the particular shift arrangement in question.

TABLE 25

POSSIBLE ABBREVIATED SHIFTS, BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY

Type of Shift	Type of Industry								
	Apparel (N=47)	Chemical and allied ind. (N=35)	Finance and ins. (N=61)	Food processing (N=28)	Manufacturing (N=63)	Paper and printing (N=20)	Services (N=53)	Textiles (N=28)	Trade (N=97)
Fewer Hours During Work Day	9%	9%	12%	0%	18%	5%	17%	7%	6%
Regular Morning Shift Only	6	3	7	11	16	5	15	7	11
Regular Afternoon Shift Only	9	3	8	7	19	5	13	11	11
Shorter Shifts at Night	6	3	2	3	3	10	4	4	7
Short Shift Before Regular Shift	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	7
Short Shift After Regular Shift	4	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5
Two Women Sharing One Job	4	6	5	4	6	10	8	7	8
Other	2	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	2

Most Interested in New Morning Shifts		Most Interested in New Afternoon Shifts	
Manufacturers	16%	Manufacturers	19%
Services	15	Services	13

The Tradespeople rank third in their relative interest in each shift, around 11% in each.

The industrial groups, other than Trades, moderately interested in new shifts arrangements, morning or afternoon only, are the same; Food-processors, Textilers, Finance-and-insurance, and Apparel. Specific levels of interest of this moderately interested group of industries are as follows (in order of rank of interest):

Moderately Interested in New Morning Shifts		Moderately Interested in New Afternoon Shifts	
Trade	11%	Textiles	11%
Food-processors	11	Trade	10
Textiles	7	Apparel	9
Finance-and-insurance	7	Finance-and-insurance	8
Apparel	6	Food-processors	7

The two industrial groups least interested in either new "morning only" or "afternoon only" shifts are the same: Paper-and-printing, registering only 5% interest for either possible new shift, and the Chemical-and-allied industries group, only 3% of which employers indicated any interest in new shifts of these two types.

From the above, it may be concluded that the only groups showing a fair amount of interest in new "morning" or "afternoon only" types of shifts are the Service industry and Manufacturers. These two industries now rank third and fourth, respectively among current users of women part-timers. To put it another way, only these employers expressed as much as 13% or more interest in implementing new "morning only" or "afternoon only" shifts.

Night Shifts

It is not clear what types of new night shifts most of the industrial groups have in mind, if indeed, they are considering any. When asked most generally about possible interest in new "shorter shifts at night," as many as 10% of the Paper-and-printing displayed interest, 7% of the Tradespeople, 6% of the Apparel industry, and lesser proportions of other industrial groups, as shown on Table 25. However, when asked to respond to the most specifically described night shifts, only three industrial groups indicated the nature of their interest. The interest shown in the "short shift after the regular shift" is as follows:

Trade	5%
Manufacturing	5
Apparel industry	4

The first two industrial groups above are also the only ones to show interest in the "short shift before the regular shift." The highest level of interest in new shift arrangements of this sort are as follows:

Trade	7%
Manufacturing	2

It is possible that two elements enter into the lack of clarity as to just what types of possible new night shifts are of interest to the various industrial groups. One is that no description offered covered the interest; the other is the form in which the questions were asked which did not encourage full cooperation in response.

Two-Women-Sharing-One-Job

Of the 28 employers expressing possible interest in establishing new arrangements by which two women could share one job, 8 are in the Trade field, and 4 each in the Services and Manufacturing; 3 in Finance-and-insurance. Only 1 or 2 employers in any other industrial group expressed any such interest. The level of interest expressed for these 4 groups is:

Trade	8%
Services	8
Manufacturing	6
Finance-and-insurance	5

It may be noted that these 4 groups are those who, in this survey, have been found to report the highest present levels of part-time hiring of women workers.

Type of Public Sector Employer

New Shifts--Fewer Hours During the Work Day

Of the 49 employers in the Public Sector who expressed interest in possible new shifts "fewer hours during the work day," 34 come from the Health and Social agency fields. Proportionally, however, the highest level of interest comes from the Schools (16%). In addition, several Federal agencies, 3 Colleges, 2 Municipal agencies, and 1 State employer display interest.

New Morning and Afternoon Shifts Only

When Public Sector employer interest in possible "morning only" and "afternoon only" shifts is considered, it may be seen that again, numerically speaking, most of the interest expressed comes from the Health and Social agency field, as shown on Table 26. Thirty-eight Health and Social agencies expressed interest in possibly developing new "morning only" shifts, while 33 indicated interest

TABLE 26

POSSIBLE ABBREVIATED SHIFTS, BY TYPE OF PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Type of Shift	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Federal (N=45)	State (N=38)	County (N=53)	Municipal (N=18)	Colleges and universities (N=39)	Health agencies and inst. (N=224)	Schools (N=31)	Social agencies (N=210)	Other (N=14)
Fewer Hours During Work Day	9%	3%	0	11%	8%	8%	16%	8%	0%
Regular Morning Shift Only	9	13	11	6	8	9	16	9	0
Regular Afternoon Shift Only	9	11	6	6	10	6	13	10	7
Short Shifts at Night	0	3	2	0	0	4	0	3	0
Short Shift Before Regular Shift	0	3	2	0	0	4	0	2	7
Shoft Shift After Regular Shift	2	11	2	0	0	8	0	4	7
Two Women Sharing One Job	9	5	8	6	8	9	7	8	7
Other	2	3	0	0	3	0	0	1	0

in "afternoon only" possibilities. Proportionally, however, Schools (16%) and State agencies (13%) showed the most interest in possible new "morning only" shifts; the same 2 groups also showed the most interest in possible new "afternoon only" shifts at the rates of 13% and 11%. As may be seen from Table 26, no more than 5 employers in any other Public Sector group displayed interest in possible new "morning only" or "afternoon only" shifts.

To summarize, from 0 to about 16% of the Public Sector employers expressed some interest in "morning only" shifts, while from about 6% to 13% of the same employers express interest in possible new "afternoon only" shifts. Proportionally, Schools and State employers show the most interest in potential new shifts of these two types, while Municipal employers and "Others" have the least interest. New afternoon shifts, proportionally speaking, are of special interest to Colleges, as well as Schools and State agencies. They are of least interest to Municipal agencies and "Others." There does not appear to be any relationship between the levels of interest expressed by the various groups and present rates of usage of these two shifts.

New Night Shifts

Of the Public Sector employers who expressed interest in possible new night shifts, the great majority came, numerically speaking, from the Health and Social agencies, in large part because there are so many of them. As may be seen from Table 26, of the 18 employers who expressed interest in introducing new "shorter shifts at night," 16 of the 18 come from Health and Social agencies. While response was higher in relation to the more specific "short shift after the regular shift," of 33 interested parties, 26 came from these two fields. Of the 16 Public Sector employers who showed interest in new "short shifts before the regular shifts," 13 come from these same two fields. Proportionally, more State agencies show interest in the short shift "after the regular shift" than any other group (11%), followed in level of interest by the Health agencies (8%) and "Others," (7%). In the case of the early morning shift, "short shift before the regular shift," proportionally, the miscellaneous agencies identified as "other" show the most interest (7%), followed at about half the rate by Health agencies.

New Arrangements for Women to Share Jobs

Proportionally speaking, the six most interested Public Sector groups registered an interest of 7% to 9% in expanding job-splitting opportunities for women.

Size of Payroll

Size of an employer, as measured by payroll, seems to have little or no relationship to willingness to consider new shift arrangements. Analysis of responses by size, both in the Public and Private Sectors, shows that either there is no relationship or that the ones existent are so small as co be unworthy of comment, differences of less than two or three per cent in most cases.

In regard to the willingness of employers to consider new arrangements by which women could share jobs, the largest employers in the Private Sector are more interested than any other group. About 14% of the largest Private Sector employers indicated such interest whereas only 2% to 7% of other size groups so indicated. In the Public Sector, the employers of 50-to-299 workers are more interested in more such arrangements, but not at markedly higher rates than any other group. The range is from 6% to 11%.

County Response

There are no significant observations in regard to employer responses to the possibility of new shift arrangements, when analyzed by County. It may be of some interest, however, to note that the two hub Counties, Philadelphia and Camden, rank among the lowest of the employers, by County, willing to consider the two-women-job-splitting concept. Each showed 6% interest, the range being from 5% to 10%.

Summary

Greater Philadelphia employers, when asked what possible new short shift arrangements they might be willing to consider introducing, showed slightly more interest in new "morning period only" shifts than afternoon and more interest in new provisions for a "short shift after the regular shift" than other suggested night arrangements. About 7% suggested possible interest in further arrangements by which two-women could share a job. Only 1% could think of any other type of shift arrangement which they thought might be implementable. There are no great differences between Public and Private Sector reaction. The Private is more interested in considering more arrangements for "fewer hours during the work day" and in "afternoon only" shifts than the Public Sector. The Public Sector is more interested in the two night shifts, "before" and "after" the regular shift. The Public Sector is also slightly more interested in expanding the two-women-one-job concept.

In reviewing the potential interest of the various industrial groups in possible new shift arrangements, it appears the industries most interested in expanding hiring for "fewer hours during the work day" are industries currently middle-range users of part-time women workers. The groups showing the most interest in "morning only" and "afternoon only" shifts are the same; the Service industry and the Manufacturers, currently third and fourth, respectively, high and mid-level of usage of part-time workers. Trade, Manufacturing, and the Apparel industries show the most interest in night shifts "before" and "after" regular shifts. The Private Sector groups showing the most interest in expanding the two-women-one-job concept are all currently major users of part-time women workers.

Most of the interest in new short-shifts in the Public Sector is expressed by the large number of Health and Social agencies-and-institutions. Proportionally, however, in regard to specific shifts, other groups sometimes show higher levels of interest. Schools are most interested in new shifts "fewer hours during the work day." Schools and State agencies show the proportionally largest interest in new "morning only" and "afternoon only" shifts. State agencies, Health agencies, and "Others" show the most interest in the short night shifts "before" and "after" the regular shifts.

Numerically speaking, in the Public Sector, most of the interest in expanding the two-women-one-job concept comes from the Health and Social agencies-and-institutions. Proportionally, however, interest among these groups and others is limited to about 7% to 9% of any Public Sector employer group.

While little interest is expressed in opening up new job-splitting opportunities for women, at least among the Private Sector employers, the largest ones, those with 1,000-or-more employees, show more interest than any other size group, about 14% indicating such interest. In the Public Sector, there is more interest among employers of

50-to-299 workers, but not markedly more than among other groups.

No significant observations were noted regarding the possibility of new shift arrangements, when examined by County of location. It may be noted, however, that Philadelphia and Camden County employers are among the least willing to consider opening up more job-splitting opportunities for women.

Patterns of Non-Standard Work Arrangements: Employer Behavior Profile

This section presents an overview of Greater Philadelphia SMSA employer behavior as described in the earlier sections of this chapter:

1) in regard to patterns of usage of non-standard work arrangements involving three variables.
    a) day-week arrangements
    b) stability of employment and
    c) extensiveness of job category coverage and
2) the pattern of usage of various short-shift arrangements.

While the accuracy of the composite picture is limited by the fact that not all employers who responded to one variable conscienciously indicated their practice in regard to all other pertinent variables, nevertheless it is believed that the size of the overall response is enough to negate the lack of total detail.

Day-Week Arrangements

Of the 797 respondent employers who have had recent experience in hiring women workers on a part-time basis, about 65% in each sector of the economy report hiring on a part-day basis. At the same time, 40% of the 298 Private

Sector employers who report recent part-time hiring experience also report hiring by the abbreviated work-week. Forty-four per cent of the 499 Public Sector employers with recent part-time hiring experience report the same.

Job Stability

In regard to stability of employment, one-third of the experienced Private Sector employers and 38% of the Public Sector ones say they offer steady employment to their part-time workers. About one-quarter of the employers in each sector say they offer employment which is irregular in terms of continuity. There is some overlap here since, of all the respondent employers who reported on the continuity of their employment (both by short-day and abbreviated week), 14% in the Private Sector and 18% in the Public Sector indicated they offer both types to their part-time employees.

Extensiveness of Job Categories

Forty-two per cent of these 298 Private Sector employers who hire by the short-day report they restrict such hiring to a limited number of job categories. Twelve per cent of these Private Sector short-day hirers report all job categories open to part-time workers. As noted in an earlier section, the Public Sector employers are much more inclined to restrict their part-time employment to a limited number of job categories than Private Sector employers, though both sectors (to the extent to which they report on this issue) indicate that they favor such limitation (see Table 2 in the first section of this chapter).

Abbreviated Week

Cross-tabulations of the data show that, of the experienced part-time employers who report hiring by the abbreviated work-week, in the Private Sector, 30% say their work is steady in character, while 26% say their part-time employment is intermittent. In the Public Sector, 42% of the employers reporting hiring by the short-week report their part-time work to be steady. Public Sector part-week employers offer about the same percentage of intermittent type work as Private Sector employers.

As with the short-day employers, a much larger proportion of experienced employers of part-timers who hire by the short-week report restriction of their part-time employment to a limited number of job categories rather than situations in which all job classifications are open to part-timers. Thirty-seven per cent of Private Sector employers and 55% of Public Sector employers report such restriction, while only 12% in each sector report all job categories open to short-week arrangements.

Employers who hire both by the Short Day and Week

Since, as mentioned earlier, 40% of the experienced Private Sector employers and 44% of the Public report use a combination of hiring patterns, short-day and short-week, investigation was made to see what patterns these employers utilize in regard to continuity of employment and extensiveness of job categories occupied by the workers in question. It was found that in the Private Sector, 24% of the experienced employers who responded to the survey use a combination of these two arrangements and offer steady employment. Twenty per cent of the experienced respondent employers use this "mix" while also reporting the offering of intermittent type employment. In the Public Sector, there is a greater difference between the proportion of those offering steady and intermittent type employment, 28% of the mixed-type employers report offering stable employment while 18% such employers report the offering of intermittent type work.

In regard to extensiveness of job categories open to part-time workers, 28% of the experienced Private Sector employers who responded to the survey say they use a mix of part-day-short-week arrangements while restricting this employment to only some job categories. In the Public Sector, 36% of the experienced employers report use of the part-day-short-week mix while restricting the job categories open to such employment.

Non-Standard Shifts

The following is an effort to develop a picture of employer behavior patterns in regard to usage of various combinations of short-shifts. In other words, do employers of one type of short-shift tend to also hire workers for other types of shifts, by day or by night? And how are employers implementing the two-women-one-job concept in the few instances where it is used?

Since employer behavior in regard to usage of various shift combinations in the Private and Public Sectors differ in some respects, descriptions of employer practice is given separately below.

Private Sector

To review usage of short-shifts by the 298 respondent Private Sector employers who reported recent experience in hiring of women part-time workers (as shown on Table 14 in section 2 of this chapter), 44% of these employers reported using some form of shift arrangement "fewer hours during the work day," one-quarter reported use of a "morning only" shift, and 35% said they use an "afternoon only" shift. A full quarter of these same employers said they use some form of night shift; 17% specified they use the short shift "after the regular shift" while 6% said they use an early morning shift "before the regular shift." One-tenth said they use some shift other than those named above. Twelve per cent said they engage in the practice of permitting two-women-to-share-one-job.

Day-time Patterns. Many of the 298 Private Sector employers engaging in the practice of part-time employment use a combination of short-shift arrangements. By means of cross-tabulations it was found that almost one-fifth of all the part-time users were using both morning and afternoon shifts. In other words, of 74 reported Private Sector users of the "morning only" shift, three-quarters also report using the "afternoon only" shift. Conversely, of the 104 Private Sector users of the "afternoon only" shift, about 55% also use the "morning only" shift.

Day-Night Combinations. Do day-time users of part-time women workers also engage in night-time hiring? According to cross-tabulations a good sized minority do. Of 131 employers of women "fewer hours during the work day," 41 (31%) report also hiring some women workers "shorter shifts at night." These 41 employers represent 14% of the 298 Private Sector employers with part-time hiring experience. Of the 131 employers using women the most popular short shift ("fewer hours"), one-quarter report using women for the short shift "after the regular shift." And 15 employers (11%) of the 131 report using women for the early morning shift "before the regular shift."

Similar patterns of usage of both day-time and night-time short-shifts may be found when the data on users of "morning only" and "afternoon only" shifts is examined. Of the 74 Private Sector users of the "morning only" shift, 28% also use the night shift "after the regular shift." Of the 104 users of the "afternoon only" shift, again 28% use the early evening shift just mentioned. As many as 35% of the users of "afternoon only" shifts report using some form of "short shift at night."

To go further, using a three-way analysis, while one-fifth of all Private Sector employers engaging in some form of part-time employment report use of both "morning only" and "afternoon only" short shifts, over one-third (36%) of these employers also use some type of night shift--only 20 such employers at best. Most of the "morning-afternoon" users who use some form of night shift favor the short shift "after the regular shift." Half as many use the early shift "before the regular shift."

In other words, it may be observed that the majority of Private Sector users of the short morning or afternoon shifts use both types. At the same time, about one-quarter to one-third of the users of either the "morning only" or "afternoon only" shifts also use some short shift at night. Of the users of both "morning only" and "afternoon only" shifts, about one-third of these users also use some night shift. As far as can be seen, the early morning shift "before the regular shift" is seldom used (but at double the rate in the Public Sector). Since there is some modest amount of overlap between reportage of "shorter shifts at night" and the popular "short shift after the regular shift" (as established by cross-tabulations), it is impossible to know how favored the short shift "after the regular shift" actually is. It is clear, from data analysis, that some employers are using night shifts which have not been described. This is confirmed by employer report as 10% of all the 298 Private employers under discussion report using "other" short shifts than those described in the survey instrument, about the same proportion as in the Public Sector.

Implementation of the Two-Women-One-Job Concept

Day-time Arrangements. Only 37 employers of the 298 Private Sector users of part-time report using the "two-women-one-job" concept. In the Private Sector this concept is being used both by day and by night, clearly with some overlapping by employers of day-time and night-time shifts.

Twenty-one Private Sector employers who report using the "two-women" concept report using women "fewer hours during the work day." Fifteen Private Sector employers using the "two women" concept report using "morning shifts only;" 20 who say they are using the "afternoon only" shift report using this job-splitting arrangement. Further cross-tabulations show that all of the employers using "morning shift only" arrangements also use "afternoon only" shifts for their part-time workers. Apparently five employers who use "afternoon only" shifts do not also have morning short shifts for their job-splitters, but use some other arrangement.

Night-time Arrangements. Since only 37 Private Sector employers engage in job-splitting altogether, the findings on night usage indicate that these employers are using both day-time and night arrangements. Seventeen of the 37 employers in the Private Sector are using the popular "short shift after the regular shift" while 6 are using the seldom-used "short shift before the regular shift."

Fourteen of the Private Sector users reported that they were using "shorter shifts at night" in conjunction with the "two-women" job-sharing concept. From data analysis there are probably a few employers who use job-sharing at night utilizing some other arrangement than the two specifically described shifts.

Public Sector Employer Patterns of Short Shift Usage

Public Sector employers who hire part-time women workers also tend to use more than one single shift arrangement. To refresh the memory, a review of Public employer reportage on shift usage is given (see Table 14 in section 2 of this chapter). Forty-three per cent of all 499 Public Sector employers of part-time women workers who reported recent experience with part-time hiring report using some women "fewer hours during the work day." (The Private Sector reported 44%). Thirty-five per cent of all 499 Public Sector employers of part-time women workers using a short "morning shift only;" 37%, a short "afternoon shift only." As for night shift usage, 11% said they use a short shift "just after the regular shift," while 3% said they use an early morning shift before the standard day-time shift. Eleven per cent said they use short shift arrangements "other" than those described. Nineteen per cent said they have situations in which two-women-share-one-job.

Day-time Patterns

The most popular short-shift arrangement in the Public Sector (as in the Private Sector) is the vaguely described "fewer hours during the work day." Forty-three per cent of the Public Sector employers say they use this shift (almost exactly the same proportion as in the Private Sector). A full quarter of the Public Sector employers indicate they use a combination of "morning only," "afternoon only" and the more generally described "fewer hours during the work day." How much overlapping is involved can not be exactly determined, but study of the data indicates that other day-time shift arrangements, "morning only" and "afternoon only" types, do exist and therefore it appears that a goodly portion of the users of such arrangements covered by the vague description "fewer hours during the work day" also use shifts related to morning or afternoon periods.

A better picture of the patterns of usage in the Public Sector may be obtained by looking at the combinations of shifts used by employers who report "morning only" shifts in usage in their establishments. Seventy-one per cent of these "morning only" users also use the "afternoon only" shift. Conversely, of the 37% of experienced part-time employers in the Public Sector who use the "afternoon only" shift, over two-thirds (68%) also use the "morning" period shift. Therefore, it appears that about the same proportion of Public Sector employers who use either morning and afternoon periods use the other type also.

Day-Night Combinations

In the Public Sector it is less usual than in the Private Sector for employers to use day-time short shifts in combination with any type of night shift. At best only 12% of the users of "morning only" or "afternoon only" shifts also use any form of night shift reported. In the case of the 216 Public Sector users of the highly popular "fewer hours than the regular work day," at best only 16% reported using any night shift specified in the survey instrument ("shorter shifts at night"). Only 10% of these same 216 Public Sector users of "fewer hours" during the day report using the short shift "after the regular shift."

Of the 125 Public Sector employers who use some women "mornings only" and others "afternoons only," only 15 (12%) also hire women for a "short shift at night." Only 10% of these users also hire for the short shift "after the regular shift." Only 3% hire for the unpopular early morning shift "before the regular shift."

Implementation of the Two-Women-One-Job Concept. Day-time Arrangements: As noted earlier, almost one-fifth of the 299 Public Sector users of some type of part-time work arrangements report they permit women to share jobs among themselves. Ninety-seven (19%) of the Public Sector employers so reported, as contrasted with 12% in the Private Sector.

Public Sector employers use both day and night periods for job-splitting as in the Private Sector. Forty-eight Public Sector employers report job-sharing among women who work "fewer hours during the work day.." Forty-one employers each report use of the "morning only" and "afternoon only" shifts. Thirty-four of these employers use both morning and afternoon shifts in connection with their job-splitting.

Night-time Arrangements: Of the 97 Public Sector employers reporting use of the "two-women" concept, 15 report using "shorter shifts at night." Twenty-one report use either of the early morning shift"before the regular shift" or the night shift "after the regular shift." As the result of data analysis, it is beleived that at least some of the 15 employers reporting use of "shorter shifts at night" are some of the same employers reporting use of the more popular night shift, short shift "after the regular shift."

The conclusion from the above is that job-splitting at night in the Public Sector appears to be less of a phenomenon than in the Private Sector. It would appear that the larger number of Public Sector employers using job-splitting are using women either mornings or afternoons, or in some combination thereof, or some other arrangement "fewer hours during the work day."

CHAPTER V

STABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT

Can the part-time woman worker with minimal skills count on her job for regular income? Or is her job not only likely to be menial and poor paying, but also irregular in duration? In other words, from an income point of view, is such a woman creating problems for herself when she seeks out and involves herself in the part-time employment which is available to her? While she may receive social approbation for assuming partial family support, is she likely to be endangering her long term financial arrangements (welfare and otherwise) by entering into a situation which is characteristically short in duration? Bancroft, in her 1958 study of part-time employment said that the majority of women part-time workers obtain steady work.[1] More recent criticisms of WIN programs and state employment service efforts on behalf of disadvantaged women have stressed instability of employment as being among the negative aspects of available employment. Since one-half of welfare mothers who are working, work part-time,[2] the question of stability of part-time employment is relevant for purposes of planning for disadvantaged women.

To ascertain whether minimally-skilled women are finding (or might be able to find) stability in such

---

[1] Bancroft, Op. Cit., pp. 88-107.

[2] Quoted by Klausner, Op. Cit. Testimony before the United States Congress, Senate Committee on Finance, 1970, p. 317.

part-time work as employers are reporting in the SMSA, an attempt has been made to learn how Greater Philadelphia SMSA employers view part-time hiring in reference to duration of employment. Do they regard their part-timers as one segment of the regular work complement or as temporary help to be acquired and disposed of as need rises or falls? If the latter, how may the temporary work situations be characterized? Because little is known about part-time work, employers can not be expected to have more than general impressions about the subject other than in regard to their own experiences. Therefore it was hoped that even generally worded questions not specifically tied to the employer's own experience might, in fact, be answered on the basis of experience. This did not necessarily prove to be the case, as will be seen. Furthermore, perceptions of the nature of part-time employment and reports of actual experience are often divergent. Some of this may reflect imperfections in the questionnaire and in interpretation of questions; part may reflect the general lack of knowledge about the usage of part-time workers. Another problem is interpretation of findings since differences in data bases used sometimes make comparisons difficult.

This chapter will present employer perceptions of the part-time employment situation in three ways: data on the kinds of job stability employers believe they themselves are offering their part-time employees; the types of labor markets they believe suitable for part-time hiring; and third, in terms of their own particular enterprises or institutions, opinions as to the feasibility of establishing stable work situations for part-time women workers at the entry level.

In regard to the amount of steady-type employment which employers believe they are offering their part-time women workers, two different sets of somewhat parallel data have been collected which do not always agree. This may be explained by the fact that one set of data deals with what employers report they are actually doing and includes reportage from the pool of 797 employers who reported recent experience with the hiring of part-time women workers. The second set of data was developed from a question asking employers "what type of regularity of employment your workers can (could) expect if part-time employment for some women workers is of any interest to your company (agency or institution)?" The respondents to this question conceivably came from the entire respondent population of 1,110 employers; certainly some employers who do not currently employ women workers must have answered (as the total number of responses tends to confirm). Therefore, definite conclusions are sometimes difficult to draw when parallel data are divergent. The findings therefore can only be used to suggest what the prevalent situation is. In the first section of this chapter in which availability of steady employment is discussed, both sets of data will be referred to where pertinent.

A summary will be made at the conclusion of this chapter in regard to the extent of current stable employment for the part-time woman workers, where it may be located, and an opinion as to prospects for further part-time work arrangements offering continuity of employment for the population under discussion.

Perceptions of Job Stability:
The Availability of Steady Employment

What Employees can Expect Regarding Stability of Employment

Public versus Private

A large proportion of the employers in this survey believe themselves to be offering stable employment to their part-time work force. When asked to indicate what type of job stability they offer, the choices being "steady" and "at certain times," 44% of the Private Sector employers and 56% of the Public Sector employers with recent part-time hiring experience said they offered "steady" employment.[1] A lesser proportion in each sector reported using intermittent type work, 38% in the Private Sector and 36% in the Public Sector. When asked a similar, but not entirely parallel, question, "If part-time employment for some women workers is of any interest to your company (agency or institution), what kinds of regularity of employment can (could) the worker expect?," 44% of the Private Sector employers and 54% of the Public answered "steady."[2] Actually, considering the choice of answers given to the respondents, the indication that steady part-time employment is often the prevalent form is reinforced by the large response to the option "depends on job." Some of these employers, many of them larger employers, must offer steady type work to at least a portion of their part-time workers. See Table 27.

Job Stability by Industry

Employer reportage of what they say they are doing in regard to the type of job stability they are currently offering their present part-time work forces, and what type

---

[1] Number in the Private Sector is 298; in the Public Sector, 499.

[2] Number in the Private Sector is 438; in the Public Sector, 672. These represent the entire employer pool who responded to the questionnaire since any one might have responded to the question. Since a large number of current non-hirers probably did not answer, the proportion of these employers indicating belief they offer or could offer steady-type employment probably represents understatement. Findings discussed in subsequent sections of this chapter tend to confirm this.

TABLE 27

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS OF STABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT OF THEIR PART-TIME WOMEN WORKERS, BY TYPE OF EMPLOYER

Stability of Employment	Percentage of Response	
	Private Sector (N=397)	Public Sector (N=599)
Steady....................	44%	54%
Seasonal..................	23	17
Depends on Job............	24	37
Unpredictable.............	13	14

Percentages are based on the number of employers who responded to this question.

of stability of employment their part-time employees have or might expect if the employer were interested in initiating such hiring, is not comparable, when expressed in percentages, in view of the greatly differing data bases used For example: the number of respondent Apparel industry employers who say they are presently engaged in hiring women part-time workers is 26, this being used to determine that 69% of Apparel industry employers who presently hire part-time women workers report they offer steady type employment. However, since 45 Apparel industry employers responded to the questionnaire, this latter figure was used as a base to determine that 29% of the Apparel industry employers believe that the work they offer or could offer is or would be steady in character. The great differences between percentages offered in the two sets of data must be viewed in terms of how the data were developed. Because of these differences, the findings will be reported upon separately below.

Reportage of stability of employment in regard to women workers presently employed on a part-time basis, industry by industry (see Table 8 in Chapter IV), shows that proportionally more part-time employers in most industrial groups employ steady than intermittent-type workers. The range of difference is very great between the various groups in regard to the offering of steady work, from about 26% among the Manufacturers to about 73% in the Paper-and-printing group. The Tradespeople, Finance-and-insurance institutions and the Services, the largest employers of part-timers, report steady employment with a range from 40% to 51%. This is almost exactly the same range into which the lesser employers of part-timers fall concerning the offering of steady employment, the Food-processors, the Textile group and the Apparel industry. Paper-and-printing, mid-range in the tendency to hire part-timers, curiously offers the most job security when it hires at all, 73% of its experienced employers stating they offer stable employment.

Exceptions to the tendency of industry groups to more frequently report the offering of stable employment, as opposed to intermittent, are the Chemical-and-allied industries and the Manufacturers. Thirty-eight per cent of the Chemical group reports steady employment, while 46% of the same group reports use of part-time workers on an intermittent basis. About one-quarter of the Manufacturers report having steady part-timers, while about 42% report using part-timers on an intermittent basis.

The employers who least often report offering intermittent employment are those who are among the least likely to employ women part-timers altogether, according to the data which they themselves have supplied in this inquiry. These are the Food-processors, 16% of whom report offering intermittent work: the Textile group a quarter of whom so report: and the Apparel group in which 27% report intermittent type part-timers. From 36% to 55% of the other industrial groups studied report intermittent type work. See Table 8 in Chapter IV.

Perceived Ability, by Industry, to Offer Steady Employment to Part-time Workers

When responses, by industry, to the question, "What type of regularity of employment can (could) your workers expect if you hire or are interested in hiring part-time women workers?," are studied, again there are great differences between groups. There appears to be a positive association between an industry's proneness to hire a part-time female work force altogether and the extent to which steady work is perceived to be available in that industry. The most frequent employers of women part-timers, the Tradespeople, the Finance-and-insurance institutions, and the Services are the employers most apt to express the opinion that what part-time employment they have or might be interested in offering is stable in nature. The industrial groups least likely to express the belief that they offer job stability, the Chemical-and-allied industries and Textiles, are the least likely to hire part-time women workers altogether. See Table 28 for comparison of industrial tendency to believe its part-time employment is steady in nature with its rate of reported hiring of women part-time workers.

Public Sector Reportage on the Stability of Employment for Current Part-time Workers

Except for Federal employers, more Public Sector employers report offering stable employment than intermittent to their part-timers. Federal agencies offer steady employment least often, about 28% so reporting. One hundred per cent of the Municipal agencies which offer part-time opportunities report steady work being involved more often than other types. Other Public Sector employers, about 74% of whom report steady work, are the County agencies, the Colleges-and-universities, and the Social

TABLE 28

EMPLOYERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE OFFERING OF STEADY EMPLOYMENT, BY INDUSTRY, AND INDUSTRY REPORTAGE OF EXTENT OF PART-TIME HIRING

Industry	Percentage Believing Part-time Workers can Expect Steady Employment (N=438)	Percentage Reporting use of Women Part-time Workers (N=438)
Trade............	73%	87%
Finance-and-insurance.....	55	82
Services.........	39	76
Paper-and-printing......	37	55
Manufacturing....	36	68
Apparel..........	29	55
Food-processing..	28	68
Textiles.........	23	43
Chemical-and-allied industries....	23	37

agencies. From about 62% to 72% of the State agencies, the Health agencies-and-institutions, Schools, and "Other" agencies also report steady employment being offered. See Table 9 in Chapter IV.

Examination shows that the Public Sector employers who report offering steady employment at highest levels include all levels of users of part-time workers, very low level users, such as the Municipal and State agencies, and high level users, such as Health agencies-and-institutions and Schools; also, the group labeled "other" which is a medium-range user of part-time workers. As may be seen from Table 9 in Chapter IV, from 62% to 100% of the groups above mentioned report offering steady work.

Perceived Ability, by Public Sector Employer, to offer Steady Employment to Part-time Workers

As in the Private Sector, Public Sector employers report great differences in the perceived capacities to offer steady part-time employment. The public service group is much more optimistic about the extent to which it offers steady employment to its part-timers than public administration which hires such workers much less frequently. Table 29 shows how this service type group in the Public Sector both tends to have a high tendency to hire part-timers and, having hired or contemplating hiring, to view the work as permanent in nature. The big exception is the College-and-university group. While 92% of the reporting institutions of higher education report experience in hiring part-time women workers, only 37% of all respondent

TABLE 29

EMPLOYERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE OFFERING OF STEADY EMPLOYMENT, BY PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER, AND PUBLIC SECTOR REPORTAGE OF EXTENT OF PART-TIME HIRING

Public Sector Employer	Percentage Believing Part-time Workers can Expect Steady Employment (N=672)	Percentage Reporting use of Women Part-time Workers (N=672
Public Sector Group		
Other.............	83%	78%
Health agencies-and institutions	65	88
Schools..........	57	84
Social agencies..	57	79
Colleges-and-universities...	37	92
Public Administration Group		
County...........	38%	53%
Municipal........	38	40
State............	36	39
Federal..........	20	29

Colleges-and-universities see their part-time work as steady in nature. This is the same level at which the public administration group views itself as offering steady employment.

Size of Payroll an Explanation of Job Stability in Employment?

One important question which this study hopes to clarify is whether the size of a business, institutional employer, or agency influences the liklihood that the employer will offer continuity of employment to his part-time workers. The data collected in this survey suggest that in the Private Sector size does not influence the tendency to offer steady work. In the Public Sector there is some evidence of size influencing the extent to which stable employment is offered.

Private Sector. Whether the data concerning stability of employment are studied by actual reportage of current employment or by employer's views as to what type of employment continuity their present or future part-time workers may expect by size, no distinct trends are to be found in the Private Sector. It may be observed in both sets of data that employers of 300-to-499 workers report less steady-type employment or expectation of such steady-type employment for part-time workers than other groups. A little less than one-third of the employers in this moderate size category see themselves as the offerers of steady-type employment. Depending on which set of data are used, up to as many as 46% of the actual "reporters" and 50% of the perceivers of self as current or future offerers of part-time work in the various size categories report their work is or would be steady in character. Not only are there no trends related to size underlying the tendency to offer steady-type employment, but neither can a statement be made as to whether larger or smaller employers are more likely to offer steady-type employment. In the reportage of actual experience the smallest employers and largest Private Sector employers report exactly the same level of steady employment. See Table 10 in Chapter IV and Table 30 in this Chapter.

Public Sector. In the Public Sector a very different picture emerges (see Table 11 in Chapter IV and Table 31 in this Chapter). In the reportage of actual usage of part-time women workers there is a positive association between size of employer payroll and liklihood of employing part-time women workers on a steady basis. A half of the smallest employers (1-to-24 workers) say they offer steady-type employment, while 68% of the largest employers so report. In addition such reportage jumps at two points as size of employer payroll increases. While about half of the present users of part-time women workers with fewer-than-50 employees report offering steady employment, 58% of the employers of 50-to-999 workers so report. Then a big jump occurs in that as many as 68% of the largest Public Sector employers report offering steady-type employment to their current part-timers.

When the data for employers' beliefs as to the type of stability of employment they offer present and would-be part-timers are considered, again, much less steady employment or prospects thereof are reported for the smallest employers than for any other group. However, the only observation which can be made around employer expression in other size categories is that the most optimisism regarding stability of present or future part-time is to be found in the 300-to-499 group (at least as optimistic in the Private Sector). Differences of expression between size categories seem to exist on a random basis.

TABLE 30

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON STABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT OF THEIR PART-TIME WOMEN WORKERS, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PRIVATE SECTOR

Stability of Employment	Size of Payroll					
	1-24 (N=113)	25-49 (N=53)	50-299 (N=114)	300-499 (N=33)	500-999 (N=40)	1,000 and over (N=44)
Steady	48%	42%	45%	33%	50%	41%
Seasonal Job	21	25	24	18	30	25
Depends on Job	16	26	20	30	30	41
Unpredictable	9	11	14	21	15	18

TABLE 31

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON STABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT OF THEIR PART-TIME WOMEN WORKERS, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PUBLIC SECTOR

Stability of Employment	Size of Payroll					
	1-24 (N=163)	25-49 (N=104)	50-299 (N=200)	300-499 (N=34)	500-999 (N=48)	1,000 and over (N=50
Steady	43%	55%	60%	65%	54%	58%
Seasonal Job	18	7	22	24	10	22
Depends on Job	36	30	34	41	63	46
Unpredictable	11	17	14	15	13	22

Summary Concerning the Presence of or Prospect of Steady Employment and Size of Payroll. Size of employer's establishment, as measured by payroll, does not explain the extent to which steady-type part-time employment may be found in a business in the Private Sector. There is some indication in the Public Sector of a positive association between actual reportage of present steady-type employment held by part-timers and size. This trend was not confirmed, however, by employer perceptions of what they currently offer and might offer should they undertake more part-time hiring. Both sets of data agree that the smallest employers offer less steady-type work or prospects thereof than larger employers.

Counties

County of location does not appear to influence the extent to which steady part-time work is in existence. In the actual reportage of current experience, by County, only one County appeared to differ much in the extent of steady part-time employing being done than any other. About 50% of most of the employers, by County, report that they offer steady part-time employment. These Counties include Philadelphia and Camden.

In regard to the reportage of the actual existence of intermittent type employment, 39% of Philadelphia employers and 29% of Camden's report they offer this type. This is about mid-range for the 8-counties, the variation being from 27% to 45%. See Table 12 in Chapter IV.

In regard to the reportage of employer perceptions of present and future part-time hiring in regard to stability of employment, greater differences exist between counties, the range being from 34% to 58%. Philadelphia and Camden Counties are about mid-to-low range in their relative standing among counties on this issue. Employers in both cases report optimism at about the 50% level (see Table 32).

Part-time Employment as a Seasonal Phenomenon

The SMSA employers who have responded to this survey have indicated clearly that many of them look upon part-time employment as a phenomenon unrelated to their every day situations. However, in reporting upon what they themselves offer in their own establishments, a different picture emerges of actual practice. Just 198 (18%) employers of the 1,110 respondents report that they themselves believe that they are offering seasonal employment to their part-time employees.

Public versus Private

Private Sector employers see themselves as offering seasonal work more often than do Public Sector employers. Twenty-three per cent of the Private Sector employers who responded to this question indicated seasonal work is being offered, while just 17% of the Public Sector employers see themselves as offering seasonal work.

Perceptions of Seasonality by Industry

Private Sector employers, by industry, report a very large range of difference in their perceptions of seasonality as a characteristic of the part-time employment they offer--from 11% to 52%. Not surprisingly, more of the Food-processors (52%) and Tradespeople (38%) believe their work to be seasonal in nature than other groups. The Apparel industry also predictably expresses a high level of belief (27%) that part-time staff works on a seasonal basis. Belief that their employment is seasonal in character is lowest among the employers in Chemical-and-allied industries (11%) and Manufacturing (7%), and the Services (14%), thus

TABLE 32

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON STABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT OF THEIR PART-TIME WOMEN WORKERS, BY COUNTY

Stability of Employment	Pennsylvania Counties					Camden Labor Area		
	Philadelphia (N=388)	Bucks (N=73)	Chester (N=91)	Delaware (N=101)	Montgomery (N=173)	Camden (N=72)	Burlington (N=50)	Gloucester (N=48)
Steady	48%	58%	57%	49%	54%	50%	34%	50%
Seasonal	19	19	23	15	24	18	18	25
Depends on Job	28	26	42	37	34	39	30	29
Unpredictable	14	16	10	13	16	7	20	10

including traditional low and high users of female part-time help among those who do not see themselves as seasonal employers. See Table 33.

Perceived Seasonality by Public Sector Employer

Public Sector employers also differ among themselves in perceptions of the seasonality of their work. From 1% to 32% see their part-time employment as being seasonal in character, a range not much different from the differences in the Private Sector if the extreme case of the Food-processors is ignored. In the Public Sector there are no sharp differences between the variation in response or range of response between the public service sector and public administration. See Table 34.

Perceived Seasonality by Size of Payroll

There does not appear to be any relationship between employers who view their part-time employment as seasonal and size of payroll.

Part-time Worker as a Casual Worker

One of the major concerns of observers of the part-time work phenomenon is that such work be differentiated from casual, intermittent type work which offers the worker no permanent status, continuity of income, or access to benefits. For this reason, efforts were made to learn to what extent part-time employment, as it now exists in the SMSA, has differentiated itself in character from that of casual labor. The finding is that about 14% (137) of the employers indicate that the jobs offered in the employer's establishment are "unpredictable" in continuity of employment.

TABLE 33

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON STABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT OF THEIR PART-TIME WOMEN WORKERS, BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY

Stability of Employment	Type of Industry								
	Apparel (N=45)	Chemical and allied ind. (N=30)	Finance and ins. (N=56)	Food processing (N=25)	Manufacturing (N=55)	Paper and printing (N=19)	Services (N=49)	Textiles (N=22)	Trade (N=91)
Steady	29%	23%	55%	28%	36%	37%	39%	23%	73%
Seasonal	27	7	20	52	11	16	14	18	38
Depends on Job	20	23	34	4	33	26	35	5	19
Unpredictable	7	37	20	4	15	5	16	18	7

TABLE 34

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON STABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT OF THEIR PART-TIME WOMEN WORKERS, BY PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Stability of Employment	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Fed-eral (N=41)	State (N=25)	County (N=45)	Muni-cipal (N=13)	Colleges and univer-sities (N=38)	Health agen-cies and inst. (N=214)	Schools (N=28)	Social agen-cies (N=183)	Other (N=12)
Steady	20%	36%	38%	38%	37%	65%	57%	57%	83%
Seasonal	22	8	13	31	21	1	32	23	25
Depends on Job	20	36	22	23	47	41	50	38	33
Unpredictable	24	0	18	15	34	1	11	14	0

Unpredictability, Public versus Private

The Private and Public Sectors report unpredictability of employment at similar levels, 13% to 14%.

Perceptions of Unpredictability by Industry

The Chemical-and-allied industries are the most apt to report unpredictability of employment (37%). This group is also the least apt to hire part-time women workers, by their own report. From 15% to 20% of the Finance-and-insurance institutions, the Textilers, the Services, and the Manufacturers report unpredictable employment for their women part-time workers. From 4% to 7% of the Tradespeople, Apparel makers, Paper-and-printing industry, and Food-processors report such unplanned employment for their part-timers. These least "unpredictable" employers are among the most apt and the middle-level employers of women part-time workers. See Table 33.

Perceptions of Unpredictability by Public Sector Employer

Colleges (34%) and Federal employers (24%) are most likely to offer part-time employment on an erratic, not-to-be-planned basis. Health agencies-and-institutions (1%), State agencies (0) and "Others" (0) are least likely to offer this type of work. Mid-range Counties (18%), Municipal agencies (15%), Social agencies (14%), and Schools (10%) say they can not offer planned-for employment. See Table 34.

One reason for the greater reportage of public administration of unpredictability in employment (with the exception of the Colleges) may be that public administration having little experience with part-time workers, tend to see them as unusual and only to be taken on under special circumstances. Personal interviews have elicited the information that, in certain systems, part-time help is generally limited to in-house accommodation to the needs of a particular employee. According to a spokesman for the union representing state workers throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, there are only about 20 to 30 part-time employees per each 500 to 1,000 employee in State institutions. These workers are, in fact, steady workers, usually employed on a half-time basis, though one situation in Pennsylvania outside the SMSA has cleaning-personnel on a four-fifths time basis. Personnel in New Jersey County offices had no specific knowledge of exact numbers of part-timers, but estimated the number to be so small as to not warrant expressing in percentages. However, the New Jersey County offices appeared more receptive to and knowledgeable of part-time workers among their employees than the Pennsylvania SMSA County offices. The City of Philadelphia, the largest Municipal employer (also the largest employer of any type in the SMSA) discourages part-time hiring as a matter of (unwritten) policy, a position supported by the union involved.

Unpredictability by Size of Payroll

Of the 137 employers who believe their part-time work to be unpredictable as to regularity of employment, the data suggest a positive association to size of employer. However, a clear trend can not be established. In each sector of the economy the smallest employers see their part-time job slots as unpredictable concerning duration of employment at half the rate of the largest employers. In the Private Sector the range is from 9% to 18%; in the Public Sector, from 11% to 22%. See Tables 30 and 31.

The Multi-type Employer

To better understand what kinds of job security SMSA employers are offering their part-time employees in terms of continuity of employment, it is necessary to clarify to what extent these employers are offering a "mix" of jobs. In larger establishments, in particular, it would appear logical that a variety of situations would lend themselves to differing solutions in regard to the character of part-time hiring. Cross-tabulations of data reporting the usage of steady-type and intermittent part-time workers reveal that, both in the Private and Public Sectors, one-third of all the employers who report offering steady-type employment to their part-time workers also report offering some intermittent type (43 or 33% of 132 employers in the Private Sector; 90 or 33% of 278 employers in the Public Sector).

To develop a better picture of employers' practices, respondents were asked to indicate whether they saw the part-time employment they are offering as "depending on the job." Of 996 employers who responded to the question, 319 say that the character of their part-time work "depends upon the job."

Mix, Public versus Private

Public employers are more apt to report a mix of employment (37%) than Private employers (24%).

Mix, by Type of Industry

The Services (35%), Finance-and-insurance (34%), and Manufacturers (33%) are those who report a mix at highest levels. This group includes all but one of the most frequent employers of part-time women workers. It would therefore make sense that these employers use their part-time employees for a large variety of job categories which would include varying continuity of employment. Two groups of employers report an employment mix at far lower rates than any other industry, the Textilers (5%) and the Food-processors (4%). The Food-processors' low level of reportage here may be attributed to this industry's exceptionally high use of seasonal labor, 52% reporting this type of employment. No ready explanation appears for Textile industry reportage. See Table 33.

Mix, by Public Sector Employer

The Public Sector employers most often reporting a mix in the type of continuity they offer their part-time workers are mostly the public service group, the more frequent employers of women part-time workers. As suggested before, this group might be expected to offer employment in more job categories and under different circumstances which would involve varying types of continuity. Fully half of reporting schools say they use a mix; 47% of the Colleges, 41% of the Health agencies-and-institutions, and 38% of the Social agencies all say they offer a mix. These are the most frequent employers of part-time women workers. The public administration group ranges from 20% reportage (Federal employers) to 36% for State agencies. See Table 34.

Mix, by Payroll

When the data concerning mix of employment continuity are examined for size of payroll, there appears to be a positive association to size. In the Private Sector the relationship is clearly delineated, with 16% of the smallest employers and 41% of the largest reporting they offer a variety of types of continuity. In the Public Sector the trend is less consistent with 30% of the smallest employers and 63% of the largest reporting this mix. These data tend to confirm the hypothesis that the frequency of the offering of the mix is related to employer ability to hire widely enough to offer a wide variety and types of opportunities to employees. Obviously larger employers are more able to do this. See Tables 30 and 31.

Summary

A majority of the responses received concerning the continuity of employment indicate that the part-time work being offered in the Greater Philadelphia SMSA is steady in character. A large number of employers indicate they offer a variety of continuities in part-time employment, while a minority indicate their work is either seasonal in nature or unpredictable in character. The Public Sector, more than the Private, reports stable employment and situations in which a mix of stable and irregular employment occurs. The Private Sector offers more seasonal opportunities. Many more private employers believe their part-time work to be steady than seasonal in character; few express the opinion that their work is largely unpredictable in character, indicating that casual type part-time work is not the mode among most of the employers studied.

There is a wide variation in the reportage of types of part-time employment being offered in regard to continuity of employment. When industry perception of current and possible hiring of steady type part-timers is considered, there appears to be a positive association between level of present use and tendency to engage in extensive hiring of women part-time workers. In the Public Sector, the public service employers are much more prone to report the offering of stable employment than public administration. Again, public service employers report much more steady part-time hiring than the public administration group.

In the Private Sector, size of employer does not appear to influence the tendency to offer steady type part-time employment. In the Public Sector there is some evidence of a positive association between size and extent of usage of part-time women workers. This was not confirmed by employers' expressions regarding the type of employment their present part-time workers and their possible future part-time employees might anticipate.

Employers' Opinions of Labor Markets Favorable to Part-time Work

After employers were asked what type of stability of employment they thought they were offering their part-timers, a few questions later they were requested to indicate what types of labor markets they thought suitable to the taking on of a part-time work force. More than one choice was permitted of the following options: "normal," "tight," "surplus," "seasonal," and "other." From comparison with data elicited from responses to the previous question regarding job stability, it has been determined that respondents answered this question in terms of general impressions and attitudes rather than in relation to their own industrial or institutional experience. It was an abstract question responded to in general terms, probably unrelated to experience, though size or organization and presence in the Public or Private Sectors appear to have influenced the response.

The data shown in Table 35 were given by the 1,086 employers who answered this question.

Public versus Private

The fact of being either in the Private or Public Sector appears to partially influence employers in their thinking about situations in which part-time work flourishes.

TABLE 35

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON TYPE OF LABOR MARKET FAVORABLE TO A PART-TIME WORK FORCE

Type of Labor Market	Frequencies of Responses	
	Number of Responses	Per Cent
Seasonal	354	33%
Normal	275	25
Tight	271	25
Surplus	129	12
Other	57	5
Total	1,086	100%

As indicated in Table 36, public employers are more likely than private employers to believe that part-time work is part of their every-day situation and also tend to more often feel that a surplus labor market is favorable to part-time hiring.

TABLE 36

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON THE TYPE OF LABOR MARKET FAVORABLE TO A PART-TIME WORK FORCE, BY TYPE OF EMPLOYER

Type of Labor Market	Frequency of Responses, by Percentage	
	Private Sector (N=458)	Public Sector (N=577)
Seasonal	36%	33%
Normal	22	30
Tight	28	25
Surplus	9	13
Other	4	7

458 responses were received in the Private Sector; 577 responses in the Public Sector. Some employers checked more than one answer; percentages therefore do not total 100%.

Perceptions by Industry

Opinions of the various industrial groups about the types of labor markets suitable for part-time hiring vary greatly. However, more employers, 354 or about 33% of all responses, saw the seasonal market as most suitable. This includes the Food-processors (58%). Textiles (45%), Apparel (35%), Chemical-and-allied industries (44%), Manufacturing (38%), Trade (36%), and Services (35%). See Table 37.

The industrial groups viewing a tight labor market as most favorable (as opposed to other options) are Manufacturers (41%), Paper-and-printing (45%), and the Insurance-and-finance institutions (35%), but many employers is these groups also think the seasonal market is suitable.

Only Tradespeople saw the "normal" situation as most favorable (38%) and only the Service fields (28%) see the "normal" situation as second most favorable. All other industries either indicated the seasonal or tight labor markets most suitable as their first or second choices. See Table 37. Opinions regarding the suitability of the surplus market do not appear to differ greatly, industry by industry, except that no one in the Paper-or-printing industries responded at all to this option.

Perceptions by Public Sector Employers

Public Sector employers also tend to think of part-time employment as being seasonal in character, but other views are expressed more strongly than in the Private Sector. The Health agencies-and-instititions (31%), along with Social agencies (33%), and that small group labeled "Other" (36%) all see the "normal" market as suitable more often than other labor market situations, including the seasonal. The County employers, among the public administration group, believe that the "normal" labor market situation is favorable at the second highest level among

TABLE 37

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON THE TYPE OF LABOR MARKET FAVORABLE TO A PART-TIME WORK FORCE, BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY

Type of Labor Market	Type of Industry								
	Apparel (N=48)	Chemical and allied ind. (N=34)	Finance and ins. (N=68)	Food pro-cessing (N=25)	Manu-factur-ing (N=69)	Paper and print-ing (N=20)	Serv-ices (N=54)	Tex-tiles (N=20)	Trade (N=103)
Normal	21%	18%	21%	20%	9%	15%	28%	5%	38%
Seasonal	35	44	28	48	38	40	35	45	36
Surplus	10	0	9	12	7	0	13	10	12
Tight	31	29	35	20	41	45	20	35	15
Other	2	9	7	0	6	0	4	5	0

446 responses were received, including 5 in industries not indicated above.

the options offered.

Only three of the Public Sector employers expressed the belief, on a first or second ranking basis, that the tight labor market was more suitable, and 11 Federal agencies expressed the belief that a surplus market was most favorable. As seen in Table 38, some groups in the public service sector tend to this view more strongly than any in the public administration group.

Size of Payroll

In the Private Sector there is an inverse association between the size of an employer and his tendency to believe that part-time employment is a fact of the usual every-day ("normal") employment picture. Thirty-four per cent of the smallest employers see the "normal" labor market as most favorable to part-time employment while only 15% of the largest employers think so. In the Public Sector there is a very slight inverse association involving a range of only 5%. See Tables 39 and 40.

In regard to those who see part-time related to supply and demand factors (i.e., a "tight" labor market), there is a positive association with size. In the Private Sector, smallest employers (14%) take this view at one-third the level of largest employers (43%). In the Public Sector there is a possitive association, but neither so clearly nor so pronounced.

There does not appear to be any clear association between size of employer and the view that the seasonal situation is favorable to part-time employment. This is a highly popular view with employers of all sizes. Within the Private Sector, the smallest employers express this view of the part-time labor market at a higher rate than any other group while largest employers are least apt to so express themselves, but this is all that might be construed to

TABLE 38

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON THE TYPE OF LABOR MARKET FAVORABLE TO A PART-TIME WORK FORCE, BY PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Type of Labor Market	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Federal (N= 47)	State (N= 28)	County (N=45)	Municipal (N= 17)	Colleges and universities (N=43)	Health agencies and inst. (N=233)	Schools (N=36)	Social agencies (N=190)	Other (N=11)
Normal	20%	18%	24%	12%	16%	30%	19%	33%	36%
Seasonal	40	36	36	35	30	26	33	29	18
Surplus	23	4	9	18	16	13	17	12	36
Tight	11	36	22	29	35	25	22	20	0
Other	6	7	9	6	2	6	8	6	9

1,086 responses were received.

TABLE 39

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON THE TYPE OF LABOR MARKET FAVORABLE TO A PART-TIME WORK FORCE, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PRIVATE SECTOR

Type of Labor Market	Size of Employer					
	1-24 (N=121)	25-49 (N=52)	50-299 (N=129)	300-499 (N=42)	500-999 (N=49)	1,000 and over (N=53)
Normal	34%	27%	19%	14%	14%	15%
Seasonal	41	33	38	31	37	30
Surplus	9	14	9	7	12	6
Tight	14	23	32	45	27	43
Other	2	3	3	2	10	5

446 responses were received.

TABLE 40

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON THE TYPE OF LABOR MARKET FAVORABLE TO A PART-TIME WORK FORCE, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PUBLIC SECTOR

Type of Labor Market	Size of Employer					
	1-24 (N=165)	25-49 (N=98)	50-299 (N=223)	300-499 (N=40)	500-999 (N=48)	1,000 and over (N=66)
Normal	28%	29%	28%	27%	23%	24%
Seasonal	35	24	30	20	38	27
Surplus	15	16	13	13	8	15
Tight	18	24	22	38	25	29
Other	5	7	8	3	6	5

640 responses were received.

suggest a trend. There is no indication of any trend within the Public Sector.

Perceptions by County

While more employers, county by county, see a seasonal labor market as more favorable to part-time employment than any other type, in five counties employers either opted for the "normal" labor market as more favorable than any other or, in effect, ranked it as the second most favorable type of labor market. See Table 41. The most urbanized counties opted more for the seasonal situation as most favorable, while Bucks and Chester Counties, among the least urbanized, saw the "normal" labor market as suitable at higher rates than any other. Gloucester County employers (among the least urban group), indicated their belief that the "normal" labor market was favorable in the second rank level, but this is also true of heavily urbanized Delaware and Camden Counties. Therefore, while these data suggest that less-urbanized counties are more apt to regard part-time employment as a fact of everyday life, it can not be taken as confirmation of such a hypothesis. As was seen in data presented earlier, the old hub counties of Philadelphia and Camden are more conservative in their usage of part-time workers than the suburban counties.

Summary

More employers believe that part-time employment is a product of seasonal demand than any other type of labor markets. About an equal number stated that the "normal" and the "tight" labor markets were suitable for part-time employment, while a much smaller group conceptualized it as suitable for a surplus labor situation. Public employers are more likely than private to believe that part-time employment is part of their everyday situation and also are more apt to see a surplus labor market as one in which

TABLE 41

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON TYPE OF LABOR MARKET FAVORABLE TO A PART-TIME WORK FORCE, BY COUNTY

Type of Labor Market	Pennsylvania Counties					Camden Labor Area		
	Philadelphia (N=413)	Bucks (N=70)	Chester (N=98)	Delaware (N=103)	Montgomery (N=206)	Camden (N=87)	Burlington (N=55)	Gloucester (N=54)
Normal	24%	30%	32%	30%	22%	25%	22%	26%
Seasonal	33	26	32	36	34	32	31	31
Surplus	12	9	8	13	12	16	18	7
Tight	26	29	20	17	30	18	25	24
Other	5	7	8	4	2	8	4	11
Total	100%	101%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	99%

1,086 responses were received.

part-time hiring might occur. Otherwise opinions did not differ much.

Opinions varied greatly among the industrial groups. Only Tradespeople and Service-type employers, as groups, opted at high rates for the "normal" labor market as suitable to the hiring of part-time workers. As noted above, the Public Sector employers are more ready than the Private to think of the "normal" labor market as suitable for employment.

In the Private Sector as a whole, there is an inverse association between size of employer and beliefs as to a "normal" labor market being favorable to the taking on of part-time workers. This does not pertain in the Public Sector where there is a positive association between size of payroll and belief in par-time hiring as applicable to a "tight" labor market. This is true in both Private and Public Sectors, but is more pronounced in the former. There is no clear association between size of employer and the popular view that the seasonal market is suitable for part-time work.

While the existence of a part-time work force has often been seen as indicative of a tight labor market situation, currently this view does not appear to be more popular than views of other suitable labor markets, such as the seasonal and the "normal." Larger employers see supply and demand factors as more important than smaller employers, especially in the Private Sector.

Seeing the "normal" labor market as suitable for the presence of a part-time work force appears to be more prevalent among employers in the suburban counties than employers in the old hub counties of Philadelphia and Camden.

Feasibility of Steady Part-time Employment in Respondents' Establishments

What do employers think is possible concerning the provision of steady work in their particular industry, agency or institution? Is it feasible to establish a pattern of steady part-time work for women at the entry level? This question was posed in the context of a series of questions on social aspects of female employment towards the end of a long and detailed questionnaire.

A majority of the 1,110 respondents to the survey (642 or 58%) indicated their belief that their type of establishment could offer stable employment to part-time women workers who do entry level type work. To avoid misunderstandings, "steady" work was defined as being employment "throughout the year as opposed to seasonal or intermittent employment." The effort was to avoid the confusion, between regular and casual employment, which Hallaire warns against.[1]

Public versus Private Opinions

Public Sector employers tend to be more optimistic than Private about the possibility of offering stable employment to this group of part-timers. Four hundred nineteen or 68% of the 614 Public Sector employers who responded to the question did so affirmatively, while only 56% or 223 of the 379 Private Sector employers who answered believed they could do so in their line of operation.

Private Sector Opinion

Opinions regarding the feasibility of offering steady part-time employment in one's own establishment differ greatly between industries, 80% of the Tradespeople being optimistic, while only 41% of the Food-processors thought it possible. See Table 42. Table 43 shows that

---

[1] Hallaire, Op. Cit., p. 68.

TABLE 42

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON FEASIBILITY OF STEADY PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT, BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY

Industry	Number of Respondents to the Question	Per Cent of Affirmative Responses
Trade........................	82	80%
Services.....................	47	64
Finance-and-insurance........	54	61
Apparel......................	44	57
Textiles.....................	21	48
Chemical-and-allied industries.................	31	48
Paper-and-printing...........	17	47
Manufacturing................	56	46
Food-processing..............	22	41

the industries whose members tend to be optimistic about such a possibility i.e., the Tradespeople, Services, and Finance-and insurance are the big current users of part-time female help. The exception to the statement is the Apparel industry, a mid-range user, which is one of the groups to express the most optimism.

In five of the eight industrial categories studied, less than half of the respondent employers express optimism that steady employment of a part-time character is possible in their industry. This includes two of the current mid-range users of part-time women workers, the Manufacturers and the Food-processors. The other industrial groups, of whose members fewer than half are optimistic on this issue,

TABLE 43

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON THE FEASIBILITY OF STEADY PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT, PRIVATE SECTOR, AND RATE OF USAGE OF PART-TIME WOMEN WORKERS, PRIVATE SECTOR

Industry	Rate of Optimism Among Private Sector Employers[1]	Rate of Recent Usage of Part-time Women Workers[2]
Trade....................	80%	87%
Services................	64	76
Finance-and-insurance...	61	82
Apparel.................	57	55
Textiles................	48	43
Chemical-and-allied industries............	48	37
Paper-and-printing......	47	55
Manufacturing...........	46	68
Food-processing.........	41	68

are the Textilers, the Paper-and-printing industry and the Chemical-and-allied industries group. It should be noted, however, that in even the least optimistic group (Food-processing) 41% of the employers felt stable part-time work to be possible.

In other words, a very large proportion of the largest users are very optimistic about the feasibility of providing stable employment as the norm for part-time women workers. In the case of lesser users, in some cases the employers show greater rates of optimism than they report current rates of usge.

Public Sector Opinion

Public Sector employers responded at about the same levels of positive feeling, as did the Private Sector employer, about the feasibility of providing stable part-time employment in their organizations. See Table 44.

---

[1] Rates are based on the numbers of employers in each industry who answered the question affirmatively or negatively.

[2] Rates are based on the number of employers in each category who responded to the questionnaire.

TABLE 44

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON FEASIBILITY OF STEADY PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT, BY TYPE OF PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Public Sector Employer	Number of Respondents to Question	Per Cent Affirmative Response
Health agencies-and-institutions	209	81%
Social agencies	187	78
Schools	31	71
Other	11	55
State	33	45
County	50	44
Colleges-and-universities	37	43
Federal	41	41
Municipal	15	33

419 responses were received

As Table 45 indicates, the Public Sector employers, at least half of whose members express such optimism regarding part-time employment, are the larger users of part-time women workers (one striking exception existing). Other than in the case of the exception, Colleges-and-universities, the lesser users of part-time women workers tend to be the least optimistic that part-time employment for women can consittute the public administration group.

As shown on Table 45, the biggest divergence between level of optimism and present experience in part-time hiring exists in the College-and-university group, where 92% of the respondents report recent part-time hiring, but only 43% believe that part-time employment can be put on a permanent, stable basis. The small group of public service sector

TABLE 45

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON THE FEASIBILITY OF STEADY PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT AND RATE OF USAGE OF PART-TIME WOMEN WORKERS, PUBLIC SECTOR

Industry	Rate of Optimism Among Public Sector Employers	Rate of Recent Usage of Part-time Women Workers
Health agencies-and-institutions...........	81%	88%
Social agencies..........	78	79
Schools..................	71	84
Other....................	55	78
State....................	45	29
County...................	44	53
Colleges-and-universities...........	43	92
Federal..................	41	40
Municipal................	33	39

employers identified as "other," also large users (79%), also show a far lower level of optimism (55%) than their relative position as a part-time hirer would suggest, in view of the overall trend. The State agencies represent an exception in the reverse direction. The State agencies-and-institutions are least likely public sector employers to engage in part-time hiring by their own report (29%), expressing a high level of confidence (43%) that their agencies could provide stable employment if part-time hiring policies were adapted.

Feasibility by Size of Payroll

In neither Private nor Public Sectors is there any observable relationship between size of employer and degree of optimism that a pattern of steady employment could be provided as the norm for women part-time workers.

It may therefore be concluded that, neither in the Public nor Private Sectors is there any relationship between

TABLE 46

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON POSSIBLE ON NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS INVOLVING STABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT, BY INDUSTRY

Stability of Employment	Type of Industry								
	Apparel (N=47)	Chemical and allied ind. (N=35)	Finance and ins. (N=61)	Food processing (N=28)	Manufacturing (N=63)	Paper and printing (N=20)	Services (N=53)	Textiles (N=28)	Trade (N=97)
Steady Work	13%	9%	7%	0%	13%	15%	6%	7%	14%
Intermittent Work	9	17	18	0	21	20	13	21	12

TABLE 47

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON POSSIBLE ON NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS INVOLVING STABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT, BY PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Stability of Employment	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Federal (N= 45)	State (N= 38)	County (N=53)	Municipal (N=18)	Colleges and universities (N=39)	Health agencies and inst. (N=224)	Schools (N=31)	Social agencies (N= 210)	Other (N=14)
Steady Work	13%	8%	13%	0%	3%	7%	13%	7%	14%
Intermittent Work	11	13	19	6	10	13	10	13	14

TABLE 48

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON POSSIBLE NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS REGARDING STABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PRIVATE SECTOR

Stability of Employment	Size of Payroll					
	1-24 (N=125)	25-49 (N=58)	50-299 (N=126)	300-499 (N=37)	500-999 (N=43)	1,000 and over (N=49)
Steady Work	16%	9%	6%	14%	5%	6%
Intermittent Work	14	12	16	27	7	20

TABLE 49

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON POSSIBLE NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS REGARDING STABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PUBLIC SECTOR

Stability of Employment	Size of Payroll					
	1-24 (N=196)	25-49 (N=116)	50-299 (N=218)	300-499 (N=38)	500-999 (N=51)	1,000 and over (N=53)
Steady Work	7%	10%	11%	5%	2%	4%
Intermittent Type	12	14	14	11	24	2

size of employer and the level of opinion that a pattern of stable employment could be developed as the norm for women part-time workers.

Feasibility by County

As with the actual provision of part-time employment for women, Philadelphia City-County employers are less optimistic regarding the establishment of a stable pattern of steady part-time employment than their suburban counterparts in Pennsylvania. Camden County employers are among the three least optimistic groups of employers, by County. See Table 50.

TABLE 50

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON THE FEASIBILITY OF POSSIBLE NON-STANDARD WORK ARRANGEMENTS INVOLVING STABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT, BY COUNTY

County	Number of Respondents to Question	Percentage Affirmative Response
Bucks...........................	76	75%
Chester.........................	90	68
Montgomery......................	177	68
Delaware........................	100	67
Gloucester, New Jersey..........	50	64
Philadelphia....................	367	62
Camden, New Jersey..............	81	60
Burlington, New Jersey..........	52	56

621 responses were received

Summary on Feasibility

A majority of employers believe that it is possible to establish a pattern of steady employment for part-time women workers in their own fields, the Public Sector being more optimistic than the Private. Differences in levels of optimism appear within both sectors, with the suggestion that the most frequent employers of part-time women workers tend to be slightly more optimistic. Both Private and Public Sector employers express optimism that such an arrangement would be possible at higher levels than they currently believe they are now offering. Their optimism is also stronger than their belief that a "normal" labor market is suitable for the hiring of a part-time work force. Size of employer is not helpful in explaining employer attitudes on this question. The hub county of the SMSA, Philadelphia City-County, and Camden County (hub of the Camden Labor Market) report less employer optimism than any other county save one.

Conclusions Regarding Stability of Part-time Employment

A majority of Greater Philadelphia employers who responded to the survey and who actually hire part-time women workers report they offer steady employment to these employees. The fact that more employers see a "seasonal" labor market as favorable to part-time employment than any other does not contradict the above statement. When asked if it is feasible to establish a pattern of steady part-time employment for the women under discussion in the employer's own facility, a larger majority than currently report offering steady part-time employment thought such a pattern was possible as the norm.

Opinions regarding job stability, however posed, vary greatly among various types of employers. This is the most fruitful criterion by which to study the topic. It appears that the employer groups who most often report hiring part-timers are the same employer groups who are most optimistic about the possibility of establishing a steady pattern of employment for such women. They are the Tradespeople, Finance-and-insurance institutions and Service industry.

Size is not helpful in explaining employer practice or attitudes in regard to continuity of part-time employment.

Employers in the old hubs of the SMSA, Philadelphia City-County and Camden County, center for the Camden Labor Market, both report part-time employment less often than other employers and are among the least optimistic in regard to the feasibility of establishing a pattern of steady employment for part-time workers.

From the above, the conclusion may be drawn that there is no justification for regarding part-time employment generically as unstable and irregular in nature. According to the data received, there is even hope that the current situations, in which considerable amounts of part-time work are stable, can be improved.

At the same time, this optimism must be tempered by the indication that few respondents are willing to be specific about opening up new part-time work arrangements, particularly arrangements which would offer the women workers continuity of employment. While the data collected probably represent understatement, the trend which they disclose, when analyzed by the various criteria utilized, are consistent with other findings.

Willingness to Consider New Steady Part-time Arrangements

As seen in the above material, a good number of employers express optimistic views on the possibilities for creating new types of non-standard work arrangements in which continuity of employment would be possible. To end this Chapter on this note would be pleasant, but unduly optimistic. For, unfortunately, when employers were asked, near the beginning of the questionnaire, to specify the types of non-standard work arrangements they might be willing to consider in their establishments, considerably fewer specified they might consider stable-type employment as opposed to intermittent-type. Only a few employers responded to the question at all, probably in large part because of the unfortunate form in which it was posed. Also, even when employers did answer, more were willing to consider instituting additional irregular-type employment than steady. Only 95 employers of the 1,110 respondents were interested in considering new stable-type short-shift arrangements, a slightly higher proportion being in the Private Sector than the Public, 15% to 13%.

Private Sector Readiness to consider New Stable Arrangements

At best only 14% to 15% of any one private employer group who responded to this survey would be willing to consider new non-standard, but stable, employment arrangements for his establishment. Even in these groups, employers were as willing or more willing to consider new non-standard arrangements on an irregular basis. Six of the eight industrial groups who specified that they might consider some possible new, stable arrangements also specified, at higher rates, that they might be willing to consider more intermittent-type employment. A good example is Finance-and-insurance in which 7% of the respondents indicate the possibility of new steady-type work while 18% said that new intermittent-type employment might be possible. See Table 46.

Public Sector Readiness

In the Public Sector, six of the nine employer groups studied are more ready to consider intermittent-type arrangements, if any, than steady, as is shown on Table 47. At best, only 13% to 14% of any Public Sector employer-group is willing to consider new non-standard arrangements offering continuity of employment. These groups are the Federal and County agencies, the Schools, and "Others." Of interest is the relatively high level of interest of the Federal employers who, in practice, report hiring predominantly intermittent-type part-time workers when they hire at all.

Size of Payroll

The larger employers are less willing than smaller employers to consider the offering of new steady employment. In the Private Sector, the breaking point is the 500-employee mark at which willingness to consider new stable-type non-standard work arrangements plummets to 5%. (Range of interest, by size categories, is 5% to 15%). The smallest employers exhibit the greatest willingness to consider stable-types of new abbreviated arrangements, but it can not be said there is a distinct trend related to size of payroll. In the Public Sector, again, the larger employers, those of 300-and-more workers, show least interest in new arrangements of a steady character. For example, only 4% of the employers of 1,000 workers or more show any interest in developing new short shifts or short weeks of steady duration. See Tables 48 and 49.

County Attitudes

Philadelphia employers are among the least ready of any employers, reviewed by County, to consider any new arrangements of a steady character. Only 7% of all Philadelphia respondents are willing to consider such a possibility, while as many as 16% of employers in Gloucester County entertain such a possibility. However, it must be added that three other Counties, including Camden reported the same low level of interest.

CHAPTER VI

EMPLOYERS' CONSIDERATIONS IN THE DECISIONS TO ENGAGE IN PART-TIME HIRING

What are the employer motivations which lead to the creation of a part-time work force as part of the business or institutional work complement? This Chapter deals with the responses which SMSA employers gave to questions directed towards clarifying this issue. The matter of possible problems in personnel administration, a business consideration which is often weighed in the literature against the advantages of the procurement of a part-time work force, is also discussed. A section on union considerations discusses what problems employers see in dealing with unions on the matter of part-time employment as well as the views of some union leaders in the SMSA who were interviewed on the subject. References will also be made to available literature on union positions.

Employer Advantages in Use of Part-time Workers

Responses, as shown on Tables 51 and 52, indicate that employers are more interested in using part-timers to ease labor shortages and to better meet peak-loads than in any other consideration. A fairly equal number of employers are interested in using part-timers to achieve greater efficiency per hour and in use of these workers to better utilize capital investment without overtime. Relatively few employers are interested in the oft-discussed issues of absenteeism and turnover as considerations.

TABLE 51

EMPLOYERS' CONSIDERATIONS IN THE DECISION TO HIRE A PART-TIME WORK FORCE

Employer Considerations	Rate of Response (N=1,578)
Meeting Peak Loads........................	35%
Better Use of Capital Investment without Overtime......................	16
Greater Efficiency........................	15
Less Absenteeism..........................	9
Less Turnover.............................	8
No or Non-Applicable......................	17
Total................................	100%

TABLE 52

FURTHER EMPLOYER CONSIDERATIONS IN THE DECISION TO HIRE A PART-TIME WORK FORCE

Employer Considerations	Rate of Response (N=696)
Ease Labor Shortages......................	60%
Better meet Customer Needs through Expanding Hours......................	35
Reduce Union Bargaining Power............	5
Total................................	100%

The literature on part-time work considers the contributions which employers are believed to derive from use of personnel who work less-than-normal hours or fewer-than-usual days of the week. The questions asked in this regard in the survey instrument were drawn largely from Hallaire's formulations on the subject as presented in his OECD report, which has been discussed in an earlier Chapter.[1]

Two questions were asked which deal with the motivation for hiring. First, did the respondent believe that

---

[1] Hallaire, Op. Cit.

"the presence of some steady part-time women workers makes (or could make) for better productivity or service" in his business or agency; the response options offered indicated: "in terms of better meeting daily and weekly peak loads;" "achieving greater efficiency per hours worked;" "better use of capital investment without overtime;" "less absenteeism;" and, "less turnover." Second, employers were asked, "Does (would) an abbreviated work-day or work-week benefit your business or institution in any of the following areas:" "ease labor shortabes;" "meet the needs of the customer better by expanding service hours;" or "help reduce full time workers' bargaining power for wage increases?" The matter of saving on fringe benefits, a question which develops as critical to the issue of employer benefits, an omission recognized only in hindsight, was not included.

Public versus Private

There is remarkable agreement between Public and Private Sector employers in regard to relative interest in the various contributions of a part-time work force to an establishment.

Views by Type of Industry

Private Sector employers show the most interest in use of part-time employees for purposes of meeting peak loads. Differences within the industrial sector appear somewhat related to relative use of part-timers.[1] The Food-processors (26% of the responses) and Textile industry (21% of the responses), mid-range and small hirers of part-timers, show the least interest while Tradespeople, larger

---

[1] For industry rankings of users of part-time women workers, see Table 1 in Appendix A.

TABLE 53

EMPLOYERS' CONSIDERATIONS IN THE DECISION TO HIRE A PART-TIME WORK FORCE, BY INDUSTRY

Employers' Considerations	Type of Industry								
	Apparel (N=67)	Chemical and allied ind. (N=40)	Finance and ins. (N=100)	Food processing (N=39)	Manufacturing (N=88)	Paper and printing (N=29)	Services (N=74)	Textiles (N=38)	Trade (N=158)
Better use of Capital Investment without Overtime	16%	10%	16%	15%	18%	10%	22%	16%	17%
Greater Efficiency	8	13	18	8	16	7	14	11	20
Meet Peak Loads Better	34	33	38	26	37	24	34	21	41
Less Absenteeism	10	5	8	15	6	14	7	13	9
Less Turnover	10	5	8	10	5	17	5	8	8
No or Non-Applicable	23	35	12	26	18	28	19	32	6
Total	101%	101%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%	101%	101%

More than one response was permitted. Totals may exceed 100% due to rounding.

√

hirers, show the most interest (41% of the responses). See Table 53.

Better use of capital investment to avoid overtime was of second most interest to Private Sector employers, with the Food-processors and Textile industries least interested and the Service industry most. Both very large and very small employers of part-time help appear to have similar reactions to the capital investment question, as seen on Table 53.

Less interest is expressed in the efficiency question than in the issue of capital investment. The Private Sector employers most interested in efficiency as an incentive for hiring part-timers are the Tradespeople, the Manufacturers, and the Finance-and-insurance institutions. Least interested are the Food-processors and the Paper-and-printing industry.

While only a small amount of attention in general seems directed towards the absenteeism and turnover issues in regard to decisions to hire part-time workers, some of the mid-range and lesser employers of part-time workers appear to show more interest than others, the Food-processors, Textile employers, the Apparel industry and the Paper-and-printing industry. At the same time some of the mid-and-low-level users of part-time workers also showed less-than-average interest, the Manufacturers and the Chemical-and-allied industries in the case of turnover; the Food-processors, Textile people and Paper-and-printing industry groups in the case of absenteeism.

Views of Public Sector Employers

Schools (49% of responses) are more interested in using part-time workers to meet peak loads than other employer groups in the Public Sector. State agencies-and-institutions (24%) and "Others" (16%) are least interested

TABLE 54

EMPLOYERS' CONSIDERATIONS IN THE DECISION TO HIRE A PART-TIME WORK FORCE, BY PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Employers' Considerations	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Fed-eral (N= 47)	State (N= 45)	County (N=53	Muni-cipal (N= 16)	Colleges and univer-sities (N=53)	Health agencies and inst. (N=374)	Schools (N=41)	Social agen-cies (N=298)	Other (N=25)
Better use of Capital Invest-ment without Overtime	11%	13%	6%	0%	13%	21%	10%	15%	16%
Greater Efficiency	9	13	11	6	17	14	24	19	40
Meet Peak Loads Better	38	24	30	31	34	35	49	35	16
Less Absenteeism	2	9	2	0	11	10	5	10	8
Less Turnover	4	7	2	0	11	9	5	8	8
No or Non-Applicable	36	33	49	63	13	10	7	13	12
Total	100%	99%	100%	100%	99%	99%	100%	100%	100%

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

in this contribution of part-time workers. See Table 54. The public administration group as a whole shows very modest interest in use of part-timers to secure greater efficiency per hours worked, (6% to 13% of responses). Schools (24%) and "Others" (40%) are more interested than any other Public Sector employers in the efficiency issue. The public service sector in general shows a higher level of interest in this issue (14% to 40%) than public administration (6% to 13%).

The overtime issue is also of markedly more interest to the public service group (10% to 21%) than to public administration (0 to 13%). It is of special interest to Health-agencies-and-institutions (21%) while Schools (10%) are least interested of the public service group. The public service group may be said to show more interest in absenteeism as an issue in the decision to hire part-time workers than public administration, but differences are not great as overall interest is very low. The same may be said in regard to turnover as an issue. See Table 54.

Views by Size of Payroll

Private Sector

There is an association between size of employer and employer interest in use of part-timers for purposes of better meeting peak loads. One-third of the smallest employer responses relating to benefits of part-time hiring expressed this view, while 40% of the largest employer responses so specified. In the Private Sector, size does not appear to affect employer views in regard to the efficiency issue, overtime as related to use of capital investment, absenteeism, or turnover. It is noteworthy, however, that the very largest employers are far less ready to say these questions, as a whole, are of no interest to them than other employers, whatever their

TABLE 55

EMPLOYERS' CONSIDERATIONS IN THE DECISION TO HIRE A PART-TIME WORK FORCE, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PRIVATE SECTOR

Employer Considerations	Size of Payroll					
	1-24 (N=153)	25-49 (N=78)	50-299 (N=199)	300-499 (N=56)	500-999 (N=66)	1,000 and over (N=81)
Better use of Capital Investment without Overtime	18%	15%	15%	16%	15%	19%
Greater Efficiency	14	15	15	13	14	16
Meet Peak Loads Better	33	31	34	34	38	40
Less Absenteeism	8	10	10	5	8	9
Less Turnover	7	6	9	11	6	7
No or Non-Applicable	20	22	17	21	20	10
Total	100%	99%	100%	100%	101%	101%

More than one response was permitted.

TABLE 56

EMPLOYERS' CONSIDERATIONS IN THE DECISION TO HIRE A PART-TIME WORK FORCE, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PUBLIC SECTOR

Employer Considerations	Size of Payroll					
	1-24 (N=234)	25-49 (N=177)	50-299 (N=328)	300-499 (N=64)	500-999 (N=69)	1,000 and over (N=73)
Better use of Capital Investment without Overtime	12%	18%	18%	19%	14%	19%
Greater Efficiency	15	18	17	16	17	8
Meet Peak Loads Better	33	30	34	38	35	48
Less Absenteeism	9	10	9	6	9	8
Less Turnover	8	8	9	6	9	3
No or Non-Applicable	24	16	13	16	16	14
Total	101%	100%	100%	101%	100%	100%

More than one response was permitted

6

size. See Table 55.

Public Sector

In the Public Sector, the interest in use of part-timers for better meeting peak loads is more pronounced among the largest employers than any other group. While from 30% to 38% of other size groups express this opinion, 48% of the largest public employers are interested in this benefit. The largest employers are also least interested in achieving greater efficiency per hours worked than any other group. Only 8% of the largest Public Sector employers' views were related to the efficiency question, while 12% to 19% of other size categories showed interest. The largest Public Sector employers show markedly less interest in the turnover question than other size groups, only 3% of the responses indicating interest in this issue, while from 6% to 9% of other size groups in the Public Sector indicated interest. The very smallest employers in the Public Sector also differ from others in their feeling that the issues posed regarding benefits of part-time hiring to them are non-applicable; 24% of the smallest employer responses so indicated while 13% to 16% of the others thought so. See Table 56.

Further Contributions of Part-time Workers

When employers were asked a second series of questions regarding possible contributions of a part-time work force to their business or institutions ("ease labor shortages, meet the needs of the customer better by expanding hours of service," and "help reduce full time workers' bargaining power for wage increases") a majority of the responses indicated that easing labor shortages was a contribution, while about 30% of the responses were to the effect that better customer service may be achieved through use of a part-time work force. Almost no one expressed interest in the matter of union bargaining power, a traditional historical fear of unions. See Table 52.

Public versus Private

As in the previous series of questions regarding contributions of part-time workers to employer needs, private and public employers registered remarkably similar attitudes.

Industry Perceptions of Further Contributions

As may be seen from Table 57, when employers were asked whether they saw easing labor shortages as a motivation for the taking on of part-time workers, responses varied greatly. The industrial groups which tend to express this interest are the mid-and-low-level hirers of women part-time workers; 87% of the Apparel industry, 79% of the Manufacturers, 72% of the Chemical-and-allied industries, 62% of the Food-processors, and 57% of the Textile group. The large hirers of part-time help also see the easing of manpower shortages as an important contribution, their own record as the providers of a large amount of steady part-time employment notwithstanding. Between 43% to 54% of the Tradespeople, Finance-and-insurance institutions, and the Services hold this view.

The above opinions suggest that the traditional lesser hirers are interested in part-time help only as a temporary expedient in a tight labor market or in a period of strong seasonal demand. Responses to a further question which was asked may soften this conclusion. When asked whether non-standard hours or work-week would help meet the needs of the customer better by expanding hours of service, over a quarter of the Food-processors, Textile

TABLE 57

FURTHER EMPLOYERS' CONSIDERATIONS IN THE DECISION TO HIRE A PART-TIME WORK FORCE, BY TYPE OF INDUSTRY

Employers' Considerations	Type of Industry								
	Apparel (N=30)	Chemical and allied ind. (N=18)	Finance and ins. (N=40)	Food processing (N=21)	Manufacturing (N=34)	Paper and printing (N=10)	Services (N=35)	Textiles (N=14)	Trade (N=93)
Better Meet Customer Needs	13%	28%	55%	29%	18%	40%	31%	29%	48%
Ease Labor Shortages	87	72	43	62	79	50	54	57	47
Reduce Union Bargaining Power	0	0	3	10	3	10	14	14	4
Total	100%	100%	101%	101%	100%	100%	99%	100%	99%

More than one response was permitted.

employers, and Chemical-and-allied industries group saw this as a benefit. While the traditional large part-time employers expressed this opinion at much higher rates (Trade 48%, Finance-and-insurance 55%, and the Services 31%) they do not necessarily see this contribution as being much greater than the easing of labor shortages. In fact, only the Finance-and-insurance institutions thought this more important than the easing of labor shortages. The conclusion remains that, regardless of actual experience and practice, employers think of part-time employment as being related to temporary pressures and tight labor market situation.

Public Sector Responses

In the Public Sector, as well as in the Private, with one exception, the majority of employers in each group see the easing of labor shortages as more important than any other possible benefit mentioned in this series of questions or earlier. Opinions as to whether part-timers were helpful in better meeting customer needs through the expansion of hours greatly varied among groups. State, County and Municipal employers, as well as the Colleges and Social agencies, expressed interest ranging from about 37% to 50% in the responses to this series of questions. See Table 58.

Views by Size of Payroll

Size of payroll is not helpful in explaining employer responses to the above further contributions of part-time workers. In both sectors the employers of 300-to-499 workers have markedly different reactions to the possible contributions, "better meet customer needs" and "ease labor shortages" than other size groups. In each sector about 74% of the responses of employers of

TABLE 58

FURTHER EMPLOYERS' CONSIDERATIONS IN THE DECISION TO HIRE A PART-TIME WORK FORCE, BY TYPE OF PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Contributions	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Federal (N=16)	State (N=15)	County (N=19)	Municipal (N=8)	Colleges and universities (N=19)	Health agencies (N=163)	Schools (N=15)	Social agencies (N=138)	Other (N=7)
Better Meet Customer Needs	6%	47%	37%	50%	42%	32%	27%	39%	72%
Ease Labor Shortages	87	47	63	50	58	64	73	54	29
Reduce Union Bargaining Power	6	7	0	0	0	4	0	7	0
Total	99%	101%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%

More than one response was permitted.

TABLE 59

FURTHER EMPLOYERS' CONSIDERATIONS IN THE DECISION TO HIRE A PART-TIME WORK FORCE, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PRIVATE SECTOR

Employers' Considerations	Size of Employer					
	1-24 (N=81)	25-49 (N=41)	50-299 (N=86)	300-499 (N=26)	500-999 (N=28)	1,000 and over (N=34)
Better Meet Customer Needs	36%	34%	40%	27%	39%	38%
Ease Labor Shortages	52	59	59	73	57	59
Reduce Union Bargaining Power	12	7	1	0	4	3
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

More than one response was permitted.

TABLE 60

FURTHER EMPLOYERS' CONSIDERATIONS IN THE DECISION TO HIRE A PART-TIME WORK FORCE, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PUBLIC SECTOR

Employers' Considerations	Size of Payroll					
	1-24 (N=100)	25-49 (N=74)	50-299 (N=137)	300-499 (N=24)	500-999 (N=31)	1,000 and over (N=34)
Better Meet Customer Needs	43%	36%	30%	25%	32%	35%
Ease Labor Shortages	49	57	67	75	68	65
Reduce Union Bargaining Power	8	7	3	0	0	0
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

More than one response was permitted.

9

300-to-499 workers indicated believe that a part-time work force contributed to easing labor shortages. This is a much higher level of such opinion than among other size groups (51% to 59% in the Private Sector; 49% to 68% in the Public Sector). This same size group is somewhat less interested in the use of part-time workers to better meet customer shortages than other size categories, about 26% of the employer response in each sector (as opposed to 36% to 40% of the response of other Private Sector employers and 30% to 43% among Public Sector groups).

In both sectors the employers of fewer-than-50 employees are much more interested in the possibility of part-time workers contributing to the reduction of union bargaining power than other groups; the smallest employers, especially in the Private Sector, are most interested. See Tables 59 and 60.

Summary

When employers were asked what contributions the part-time work force makes to the operation of their establishment, the largest number indicated their interests lie in the better meeting of peak loads and easing of labor shortages. Many fewer, but a sizable number, are interested in the better use of capital investment without resorting to overtime payments and in the efficiency issue. Considerable interest was also expressed in better meeting customer needs through the expansion of hours of work. Comparatively little interest was expressed in the oft-discussed issues of reducing absenteeism and turnover. Almost no interest is manifested in the reduction of union bargaining power through use of part-timers. This in part may be due to the large number of non-union employers answering the questionnaire, as will be seen in a following section, but is insufficient to explain the large-scale ignoring of this issue as a factor in the decision to hire part-time workers.

Views of Public and Private Sector employers are remarkably similar in regard to the advantages seen as accruing from part-time employment.

Opinions as to the relative importance of possible benefits differ greatly among the various employer groups. Within the Private Sector some of the lesser hirers of part-time workers show lesser interest in the contributions seen as most important by the respondent group as a whole. These employers tend to be the continuous-process industries where the claim is often made that everyone is needed all the time so that the "line" operation will not be slowed by expensive machinery standing idle. If any generalization may be made as to areas of benefit of greater interest to these lesser users, it would be that they sometimes show more interest in the absenteeism issue than other employers. These employers were often generous in noting "no" to the request for indications of possible benefits. At the same time it must be noted that a substantial minority in the various industrial categories do see benefits accruing to themselves and do engage in part-time hiring, some of which is on a steady basis, as has been shown in an earlier section.

In the Public Sector, as in the Private, more interest is expressed in meeting peak loads better through the use of part-time workers than any other benefit. Among the outstanding differences which may be noted in responses, Schools and "Other" institutions are far more interested in use of part-time personnel for purposes of achieving greater efficiency than any other group in the Public Sector, about 24% and 40% of the responses, respectively. As reported by union officials, as will be seen in a later section, hospitals and other Health agencies are especially interested in the use of part-time staff for purposes of "better use of capital investment" without use of overtime (about 21% of the responses, other groups responding at the 6% to 16% levels).

On an overall basis, size of employer is not helpful in explaining employer beliefs on the contributions which a part-time work force makes to their establishment's well-functioning. However, concerning the widespread belief that part-time workers help employers meet peak loads better, there is a positive association between strength of belief and size in the Private Sector. In the Public Sector the larger employers are most interested in this as a contribution. In the Private Sector, size does not explain employer interest in most of the possible contributions, of part-time workers to plant functioning which were specified. In the Public Sector, the largest employers display different tendencies than other size employers: they are more interested in using part-timers for meeting peak loads; less interested in the efficiency issue; less interested in the turnover question than other groups.

Failure to include the factor of non-payment of benefits to part-time workers, often cited as a prime incentive for the acquisition of a part-time work force, limits the validity of the overall picture of employer motivations in part-time hiring, as presented above.

Problems in Personnel Administration

What are the problems of a part-time work force related to personnel administration, as experienced or anticipated by the respondents to this survey? The great majority of employers who answered see "no difficulties" at all. Of 1,015 respondents (more than one response being possible), 709 or 70% of all responses are to this effect. Three hundred six responses were given to three

12

other possible answers to the question, "Would you anticipate (do you have) personnel difficulties if you were to hire some part-time women workers?" The three other possible answers were: "Desire of full time women to switch to part-time," "increased supervisory costs," "friction between full time and part-time employees." Responses were as follows: friction between full timers and part-timers, 122 (12% of all responses); increased supervisory costs, 94 (9%); desire of full timers to switch to part-time, 90 (9%).

Public versus Private

When employer attitudes on personnel questions are considered in relation to differences between the Private Sector and the Public Sector, it is found that Public Sector employers tend to be more optimistic than Private in saying that no difficulties exist, 67% and 59%, respectively. A slightly higher percentage of private employers thought that the desire of full timers to switch to part-time might present a problem while several per cent more public employers thought that supervisory costs might be higher.

Responses by Industry

Employers' responses to questions regarding possible administrative problems in regard to personnel appear to be related to actual experience. Examination of Table 61 will show that the industrial groups having the greatest experience with part-time workers are those reporting "no difficulties" at the highest levels. Thus, the Services, Tradespeople, and Finance-and-insurance people report "no difficulties" at the 80%, 88% and 78% levels, respectively, while the Textile group so reports at the 42% level, the Chemical-and-allied industries at the 44% level.

TABLE 61

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON PERSONNEL DIFFICULTIES RELATED TO PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY

Personnel Problems	Type of Industry								
	Apparel (N=47)	Chemical and allied ind. (N=36)	Finance and ins. (N=53)	Food processing (N=22)	Manufacturing (N=54)	Paper and printing (N=16)	Services (N=45)	Textiles (N=26)	Trade (N=72)
Friction between Part and Full Timers	17%	22%	8%	14%	11%	19%	16%	15%	6%
Increased Supervisory Costs	4	11	6	9	15	6	4	15	3
Switching of Full time Workers to Part-time	15	22	15	27	6	0	0	27	4
No Difficulties	64	44	72	50	69	75	80	42	88
Total	100%	99%	101%	100%	101%	100%	100%	99%	101%

More than one response was permitted. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 62

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON PERSONNEL DIFFICULTIES RELATED TO PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT, BY PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Personnel Problems	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Federal (N= 38)	State (N= 37)	County (N= 45)	Municipal (N= 23)	Colleges and universities (N=37)	Health agencies and inst. (N=227)	Schools (N=30)	Social agencies (N=189)	Other (N=11)
Friction between part and full timers	5%	19%	11%	30%	14%	10%	23%	7%	0%
Increased Supervisory Costs	13	16	18	17	14	10	7	7	0
Switching of Full time Workers to Part-time	8	19	7	22	8	8	10	4	0
No Difficulties	74	46	64	30	65	71	60	82	100
Total	100%	100%	100%	99%	101%	99%	100%	100%	100%

More than one response was permitted

3

It is difficult to make generalizations regarding the other responses concerning personnel problems. In regard to higher supervisory costs, Manufacturers, Textile operators, and the Chemical-and-allied industries are the groups who express this fear most frequently. The Chemical-and-allied industries, Food-processors, and Apparel industries express a relatively high level of concern about friction between part-timers and full timers. These tend to be industrial groups who are mid-level-or-low-level hirers of part-time workers.

Public Sector Responses

Public administration tends to be less optimistic that "no difficulties" exist in dealing with part-time workers in regard to personnel problems than the public service sector. This is also true in regard to two of the three other possible sources of problem specified, full timers switching to part-time and increased supervisory costs. In regard to hiring being a source of friction between part and full timers, reactions were mixed. See Table 62.

Response by Size of Payroll

Employer size, as measured by payroll, does not explain opinions concerning personnel administration in relation to part-time hiring.

Some observations of possible interest appear, but no trends. In the Private Sector the very smallest employers are markedly less concerned about the possibility of full timers wanting to switch to part-time than other size groups (3% as opposed to 8% to 21% in other groups). Oddly it is the smallest employers and the largest who are far more optimistic than other groups about the absence of difficulties in the area of personnel administration than other groups (around 80% as opposed to 56% to 62% among other size groups).

In the Public Sector it is the larger employers, those of 500-or-more workers, who are most concerned about the possibility of full timers wanting to switch to part-time work (about 12% as opposed to 3% to 8% among other size groups). These larger employers are also less optimistic about lack of difficulties in regard to personnel administration concerning part-time workers, about 64% (as opposed to 71% to 82% among other size groups).

There are no trends or observations of interest in regard to size concerning possible problems involving supervisory costs or possible relationship problems between full timers and part-timers.

Summary

Most of the employers who expressed themselves on the question of reputed personnel problems related to the hiring of some women on a part-time basis did not see any difficulties being involved. The Public Sector was even more optimistic on this score than the Private. There were considerable variations among industrial groups, with those industries who have the most experience with hiring women part-timers appearing more optimistic than those who did not. The public administration group appears less optimistic than the public service employers who have more experience with this practice.

Concerning responses to suggested sources of the problem, more employers are concerned about possible friction between full timers and part-timers than about supervisory costs or the causing of discontent among the regular full time staff in regard to hours. Some differences in levels of response appear among the various industrial groups and Public Sector employers, but little in regard to differences in size.

Unions as a Factor in the Decision to Hire

Because union attitudes have been of traditional interest to students of part-time employment, an attempt was made in this inquiry to learn what employers' experiences or beliefs (in lieu of experience) are in regard to union reactions to part-time hiring practices. It was also thought wise to contact at least a few unions whose membership has traditionally been female to ascertain their positions directly, as opposed to the perceptions of employers.

As will be seen in the following, employers responded very poorly to questions in regard to unionism, for reasons unclear. When they did respond they did not appear as concerned about issues supposedly of traditional interest as might have been anticipated from the literature. The survey data in regard to unionism can not be regarded as adequate since more problems associated with unions should have emerged, as will be seen from the data presented below.

This section will first present employer responses to the question inquiring as to the type of union difficulties which develop or might develop if part-time hiring were to occur. The options offered were formulated from Hallaire's presentation of traditional union objections to part-time employment.[1] The specified options offered for employer reaction were: "fears of loss of overtime;" "fears of loss of leverage in wage demands;" "fears of inability to organize;" "no difficulties;" and "no union." As will be noted below, a serious omission was "lack of inclusion of benefits." Second, the views of a few Greater

---

[1] Hallaire, Op. Cit., pp. 54-62.

Philadelphia union officials will be given, officials specifically sought out because of their union's reputation or peculiar strategic position in relationship to employers of large numbers of women and/or employers in growth fields. Last, a conclusion will be given as to union positions as opposed to employer reports.

Survey Data

At least 82% of the 1,110 respondent employers responded to the survey question regarding union problems. Unfortunately, only 61 employers, at best, responded to the options specifying union problems. Almost a full quarter of the respondents said they would expect "no difficulties" from unions if they were to hire women part-time workers (if they do not already). Sixty per cent said they were non-unionized.

In regard to differences in employers' perceptions of union fears, by size of employer, there is no clear pattern in either sector of the economy. Differences exist by county, but not by any pattern which can be explained. Employer reportage of perceptions of union fears regarding part-time employment are too low to permit meaningful analysis by industry or public sector employer.

Unionized Employers' Reportage

Cross-tabulations of the data on unions reveal that only a half-dozen of the employers who reported that they had "no difficulties" with unions in regard to part-time hiring, also reported not being unionized i.e., it appears that only employers who actually are unionized reported "no difficulties" with unions. Making the assumption that all employers who did not report non-unionization are, in fact, unionized, the data regarding employer problems were analyzed, using as a data base, the number of employers actually believed to have unions. As noted above, this is justified on the basis that only employers having a union presence are believed to have responded to the various options regarding possible union problems. Table 63 shows the level of reportage of union problems as reported by employers believed to be unionized.

TABLE 63

UNIONIZED EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS REGARDING UNION ATTITUDES TOWARD A PART-TIME WORK FORCE

Employer Opinions Concerning Union Attitudes	Rate of Response	
	Private Sector (N=185)	Public Sector (N=272)
Fears of loss of Overtime...	21%	8%
Fears of loss of Leverage in Wage Demands...........	10	8
Fears of Inability to Organize..................	6	6
No Difficulties.............	52	62

As may be seen from Table 63, the Private Sector is much more interested in union concerns regarding loss of overtime than the Public. About one-fifth of the private unionized employers expressed this belief; only 8% of the public. Private and Public Sector opinions concerning possible union fears regarding reduced bargaining power and ability to organize are about equal, around 9% in the case of fears concerning bargaining power and 6% in regard to organizing. Private Sector employers who are unionized are less optimistic about their union relations in regard to part-time employment than Public Sector employers, 52% to 62% reporting "no difficulties", respectively.

A Biased Survey

While one union representative has suggested that the data indicate that the survey was biased in favor of non-union employers, that is not believed to be the case. If the assumption is made that larger employers tend to be more often unionized than smaller, then the target employers in the SMSA would have included a disproportionately large number of unionized establishments. This is because all known employers in the Private Sector who are employers of 500-or-more employees were contacted. The case may be made that the large number of hospitals and Health institutions and Social agencies in the Public Sector who responded are not yet organized nor are some of the public administration agencies who responded. However, when the responses are studied by type of employer, they are remarkably similar. The Public Sector reports "no union" at only a 3% higher level than the Private Sector. It would therefore appear that another explanation must be found.

From the letters received from large employers, especially public utilities and larger-scale bureaucratic-type industrial organizations, it would appear that, first, a self-selected group has responded to the questionnaire, with many unionized firms refraining from answering. Second, of those unionized companies who did answer, some may have refrained from answering the questions on union problems because of fears of confidentiality since the company name was on the questionnaire. Perhaps not enough options were offered in response to questions on unionization to provide opportunity to express the problems experienced by union firms. Since analysis of the return by size category has been made and a good sampling from all size categories achieved, it would appear that many union employers would be included, especially in the larger size categories. Therefore, either these companies did not answer the specific questions or they may genuinely feel that unions do not present problems to them in regard to part-time employment.

The conclusion may be drawn that, in unionized situations where part-time employment is presently existent, employers do not appear to be greatly concerned about the traditional objections of unions to part-time workers. In the case of the 60% of the respondents who report non-union facilities there may safely be said to be a greater lack of concern since a union presence is not part of the current picture. In other words, most of the respondent employers do not see union objections as an impediment to present or future implementation of a part-time hiring policy.

Union Views

Expressions in the Literature

American unions have not published a body of literature on the subject of part-time employment. One possible explanation is that part-time work arrangements are not regarded as a problem by many unions, as shall be seen later in this section. Another possible explanation is that unions who do see part-time work as a problem have dealt with it effectively through prohibition. Another reason which has been suggested is that, with the standard work week significantly declining since 1947, the aim of the American labor movement is to eliminate or at least lessen the problem through the shortening of the work day to the point that part-time work would no longer be a factor.[1]

According to European-based writing on union attitudes,[2] these attitudes depend largely on whether the jobs involved are in the industrial or non-industrial sectors. If the jobs in the non-industrial sector would, by their nature, not be normally filled by full time workers, no competition is seen for employment. It is when the part-time situation reaches into the industrial sector that unions usually object. According to response received from trade unions in the course of the 1957 survey of the ILO, the chief reaction was to insist upon safeguards where part-time employment existed. According to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the first and most important safeguard is the assurance that full employment will be maintained by the appropriate economic policies. While such conditions prevailed, unions were willing to participate in investigations encouraging the employment of women part-time, but reserved the right to revise their attitudes in light of changed economic conditions, especially changes in the level of employment. Another safeguard that trade unions insisted upon was that wages and working conditions of part-time workers be governed by trade union contracts and in no way be inferior to those of full time employees. From the viewpoint of the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions, the system of part-time employment is a valuable means of supplementing family income without disturbing family life too much, but this federation, too, saw the need for safeguards.

---

[1] This approach was mentioned in a 1957 International Labor Review report on trends in part-time employment entitled, "Reports and Inquiries: Part-time Employment for Women with Family Responsibilities," Vol. LXXV, No. 6 (June, 1957), p. 550. It was also mentioned by a Greater Philadelphia SMSA labor leader of national standing in an interview with the investigator.

[2] "Reports and Inquiries: Part-time Employment for Women with Family Responsibilities," Op. Cit., p. 551.

Hewes, in her report on women part-timers in the United States,[1] attributes union resistance to part-time employment to a belief that part-timers are very difficult to organize and that employers welcome them for that reason, a view in part disputed by the union leaders interviewed for purposes of this inquiry. American unionists are said to wish to control the conditions under which part-time employment takes place through collective bargaining, a position not unlike the European union stances.

---

[1] Hewes, Op. Cit., pp. 445-446.

According to Hallaire, who has made the most comprehensive study of the issues surrounding part-time employment, the most common arguments used by disapproving unions in the European countries he studied are:

1) rates of pay are inadequate;
2) the risk of delaying the reduction of working hours;
3) part-time employment offers only subordinate and "substitute" jobs with no guarantee of employment;
4) the creation of a part-time labor market might offset the pressure for wage claims;
5) part-time employment is competitive with full time employment where under-employment exists;
6) part-time employment hinders the occupational advancement of women;
7) part-time employment might lead to demands for faster work rates from full time workers; and
8) part-time employment creates a separate category of worker.[1]

In addition to the above, the problem of union affiliation exists in that union membership tends to be lower among part-time workers than full time.

Hallaire summarizes his refutations of these union fears as follows:

> We think that the misunderstandings or criticisms of part-time employment (by unions) are

---

[1] Hallaire, Op. Cit., pp. 58-67.

> based on: (a) confusion between part-time and casual labor. . . . If part-time labor is defined as permanent and stable, many of the criticisms mentioned above collapse; (b) the fear of a possible extension of part-time labor in sectors or regions where there is under-employment or unemployment . . . it has not developed so far and will probably only do so in sectors where there is a manpower shortage; (c) a Malthusian conception of economics on the part of trade union organizations, for whom the volume of jobs available in a country is a constant which is independent of the volume of applicants for employment . . . . In a growing economy, experience shows the demand for labor continues to grow.[1]

An interesting view of part-time employment is expressed in a publication of a Swedish trade union. The union statement recognizes the problems related to part-time work, but also the possible contributions it may make to women's welfare . . .

> Summarizing, one can say that part-time working is, in many respects, a necessity and a satisfactory solution for a number of people. What is important, however, is that all should be aware of the possible consequences as far as social benefits and future prospects are concerned. It is also necessary to keep part-time working down to reasonable proportions and to have a much clearer policy on the length and distribution of working periods coming with the meaning of the term.[2]

Part-time employment is of sufficient prominence in Sweden that when a Working Group was set up in February, 1972 to deal with questions about various types of working

---

[1] Hallaire, Op. Cit., p. 68.

[2] The Trade Unions and the Family; a Report by the LO for Family Questions (Bokforlaget Prisma Stokholm in conjunction with the Swedish Trade Union Confederation (LO), 1970), p. 34.

3

hours, the matter of part-time arrangements was included. An official of the Swedish Landsorganisationen Trade Union Confederation further states that:

> generally LO regards part-time work as a favorable form of working hours for certain groups. . . . On the other hand part-time work must not develop in such a direction that persons working part-time become a group that stands outside the benefits regulated in legislation or agreements. Rules for part-time work should be drawn up by negotiations. Since the largest part of the part-time workers are women, part-time work is often regarded as a negative form of work, especially as regards the possibilities for promotion or to get more qualified tasks.[1]

Sufficient concern about part-time work exists in Sweden for studies to be made regarding its presence and practice within various industrial groups.[2]

Union Leaders' Expressions

While, as noted above, a number of European-based labor federations have expressed themselves in regard to part-time employment, the investigator has been unable to obtain any such material on the subject from the national labor movement in the United States. A spokesman for a national union long known for innovation and social concern stated to the investigator that although a majority of its membership is female, little part-time work is known in that industry and that membership has no sympathy for women who seek to work only part-time to supplement other forms of income such as welfare. Since the union women work full time, raise families, and are active both in the union and other organizations such as PTA's, they lack empathy with women who do less, the union spokesman reported.

---

[1] Letter from Gertrud Sigurdsen, Secretary, Landsorganisationen, Stockholm, Sweden, November, 1972.

[2] The Personnel Administration Council has made a recent study of conditions of work of part-time employees in retail trade while the Women's Council within the LO Labor Federation have made a study of the availability and opportunities offered by part-time employment, based on responses from 38 unions within the LO. Respective titles: Jens Soderland. Part-time Work within Retail Trade (Stockholm: Personnel Administration Council, 1968); Women's Council, Bulletin about Part-time Work (Mimeo, no date).

Discussions with 10 local Philadelphia-based union leaders indicate why a uniform union position on part-time employment would be difficult to formulate. The first problem is dearth of information. Union representatives in one local do not necessarily know practice in another local in the city. Second, a number of union leaders in both Public and Private Sectors said that the problem had not become visible in their arena so that no issues existed; no position was required. Others who had had a great deal of such experience, such as in the restaurant field, said that it was a way of life in the industry, of mutual benefit to both worker and industry. A clothing industry leader said the union was opposed to part-time employment, but, since the employers also did not want it, there was no problem. In two fields in which part-time employment is very prominent, retail trade and hospitals, union organizers saw the problem as employer attitudes rather than lack of union enthusiasm or organizability on the part of less-than-full time workers. Therefore the union position depends upon employer motivations in hiring of part-timers, the extent to which this is being done, and whether the practice is seen as being mutually beneficial to workers and industry, without at the same time infringing upon the rights and privileges of the majority of workers as interpreted by union leadership.

The issue of greatest interest to the unions contacted was that of overtime. Part-time work was either rejected outright or feared because of the possible effect on present overtime which is obtained by union members. Although contrary to union philosophy, according to a leading Philadelphia union theorist, workers now depend on their overtime for a living wage. City of Philadelphia workers, according to a municipal workers' union representative, not only may secure nine hours overtime a week to increase earnings, but also enough additional work to bring their earnings up to the Social Security maximum for purposes of obtaining future benefits. The presence of part-time workers might disrupt this situation. Another public workers' respresentative stated that her union did not object to the presence of part-time workers, some of whom are already covered by union contracts, but does object to the hiring of such workers "on an overlapping shift basis" because such a practice would interfere with the best opportunities of present full time workers to obtain overtime. They would also object to part-time workers hired for the middle of a shift. On the other hand, two women splitting one job would not be deemed objectionable.

Among the most frequent hirers of part-time workers in the Public Sector are hospitals. According to a hospital workers' union organizer, benefits, or the lack thereof, for part-timers is a prime motive for hospitals' interest in such practice, as well as the ability to pay minimum wages. A nationally-known Philadelphia labor leader states that the benefits question is of prime interest to employers who hire part-time workers. His union and others attempt to include benefits where part-timers are involved, thus eliminating some of the objective advantage of this hiring practice. However, he believed that, in his industry, in which widespread part-time hiring is traditional, the most constructive approach is to work for a shortening of the standard work-week so that many part-time working arrangements would approach or equal standard hours. With flexibility on the part of the employer, he thought, many present part-time workers could extend their hours enough to bring them in line with a shortened standard work-day. He considered some present part-time persons as underemployed, but conceded that certain groups such as suburban housewives, Social Security recipients, and "others" might actually desire very limited hours. According to this union leader, the attitudes of employers, industry by industry, tend to differ regarding part-time employment, depending on whether they are union or unorganized, for benefits tend to differ. Also, he noted that employers in union shops are interested in whether women workers are heads-of-households because, again, benefits differ.

None of the unions consulted felt that part-time workers were impossible to organize, but as one put it, they pose a "difficult, but not insurmountable" problem. Others state that part-timers are coming to them, asking to be organized. One union is composed only of part-time personnel. However, as one organizer put it, "employers believe that they are harder to organize." Another veteran said that all organizing was hard; that the problem was employers, not the workers.

Because Transport Workers and Teamsters are not traditional hirers of women, no attempt was made to interview representatives of these unions. However, according to the Philadelphia Free Press of March 21, 1973, one of the recent contract demands of the Transport Workers was "no part-time help and no subcontracting. Part-time help would eliminate a lot of the overtime that many of us need to support our families. . . . Both proposals are designed to cut into the union's strength." As the representative of another union explained, this union's strategy is to avoid taking in the part-timers. This appears to be the pattern in public utilities in the Philadelphia area, as evidenced by letters received from these companies explaining that they are forbidden to hire part-time help by union contract. A number of other large unions, outside public utilities, mentioned their opposition to the use of temporary help agencies for purposes of obtaining temporary part-time help,[1] but not to part-time arrangements per se, as do the Transport Workers.

The varying strategies of the union leaders whose views were solicited, leaders in the Public and Private Sectors where minimally-skilled women tend to work, might be summarized as follows: (a) no problem, part-timers are covered in contracts as a separate worker category; (b) try to eliminate this category of worker by eventual reduction of part-time employment through reduction in the hours of full time workers; that greater flexibility on the part of the employers would make it possible for most present part-timers to work the new, shorter standard hours; and (c) control and/or eliminate the benefits of part-time employment to employers through contract provisions which demand full fringe benefits for these workers and strict limitations on the circumstances under which they might be used. A fourth strategy, practiced by unions such as the Transport Workers, unions for public utilities, and certain other large unions, is exclusion through contract prohibition.

---

[1] Use of such part-time help agencies is indeed the practice of some of the largest employers. A number of these very large employers who were contacted for purposes of this survey wrote back that they had no part-time workers as part of their regular work complements for this reason.

Special Employment Programs

Because Public Sector unions have had to deal with a number of special employment programs in the past few years, New Careers programs, Veterans privileges, Affirmative Action plans, the Emergency Public Employment Act implementation, etc., the union representatives were asked how they would react to possible new programs involving preferential hiring of minimally-skilled women, especially those who carry family responsibility. (Such employment might or might not be on a part-time basis). The majority response was that these unions had attempted in the past to negotiate such programs in regard to protection of their present membership, while at the same time attempting to find ways to respond positively to the possibility of benefit to disadvantaged groups. One very large union has felt that the professionals in the union welcome all the auxiliary help generated by such programs and so accepted the programs making this possible. Other representatives gave examples to show how they had used such situations to mutual advantage of program planners and unions to achieve secondary goals such as that of racial integration.

From the responses of the union representatives described above, among whom are leaders of the fastest growing Public Sector unions in the United States, it is apparent that the presence of unions in the public sector is not a necessary impediment to implementation of programs striving for inclusion of disadvantaged groups as such. Union representatives indicate they have had enough experience to believe they can deal constructively with such situations and still safeguard the positions of their membership.

The Changing Position of Women in Unions as a Factor

An unknown factor affecting future union attitudes toward women's problems, including the need for non-standard working hours, is the changing position of women in unions; namely, there are more of them than ever before and they are beginning to demand leadership positions.[1] Whether the increased female presence, both in the ranks and in leadership, will mean more sympathetic consideration of female problems is unclear. Conversations with female leadership of at least two unions which were contacted created the impression that women policy-makers might be less lenient in regard to consideration of individual women workers' needs than present leadership; also, that they might be highly punitive towards women who do not choose total commitment to the work force. However, these attitudes might not preclude women at the grass roots, if not in leadership positions, from pressing for changes in overall work conditions and social provisions.

---

[1] Lucretia M. Dewey, in "Women in Labor Unions," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 94, No. 2 (February, 1971), pp. 42-48, points out that while 600,000 women joined labor unions in the decade following 1958, the ratio of women union members to women in the labor market has declined. Yet, since a major proportion of the total female union membership is concentrated in a small number of unions, women may be in a position to influence policies in these unions. Four of the most prominent were identified by Dewey as being the Retail Clerks International Union, Service Employees International Union, United Automobile Workers, and the American Federation of Government Employees. Women are prominently involved in the recent upsurge of membership in government unions on all levels. Dewey also cites a BLS 1967 study of unaffiliated unions which shows that women represent a greater proportion of the membership of unaffiliated union membership than in national unions. (Unaffiliated, Interstate, and Single-Employer Unions, 1967. BLS Bulletin 1640, 1969).

30

Summary

Employers who responded to questions on possible union difficulties in regard to part-time hiring believe that fear of loss of overtime is the most important issue they have to deal with, but do not attach the importance to this that unions do. Although a majority of the respondents have no unions, the opinions of those who responded to this question appear to be based on experience. The responses may be taken to indicate that fears of union problems are not an inhibiting factor in the hiring of part-time help on the part of a large percentage of respondent SMSA employers, both those who have unions and the majority who do not.

It is not believed that the target group of employers who were surveyed are non-union, but rather that either those who responded are non-union or did not choose to answer this particular question, possibly because of fears of lack of confidentiality since the employers' name was on the questionnaire.

A small number of union representatives were contacted for their views on part-time work. These unions represent industries which are heavy hirers of minimally-skilled women in the Public and Private Sectors. These responses show that union positions vary according to the nature of the industry and the degree to which the problem has surfaced in their field. Information on union policy and practice is not always known by individual locals of a large union.

Union strategies in the case of those representatives interviewed may be summarized as follows: (a) no proplem, cover in contracts as a separate worker category; (b) try to eliminate this category by eventual reduction of part-time employment through reduction in the hours of full time workers so that most part-timers could then work the new, shortened standard hours; and, (c) control and/or eliminate the benefits of part-time employment to employers through contract provisions which demand full fringe benefits for these workers and strict limitations on the circumstances under which they may be used. A fourth union strategy, practiced by Transport Workers, public utility unions, and certain very large unions is to exclude all part-time through contract provision. Several Public Sector union representatives indicated that their response to a possible new employment program would be to negotiate the situation in positive terms, protecting the rights of their present membership, while also responding to social planning for disadvantaged groups on a constructive level.

A factor of unknown portent for the future in unions is the increasing female membership combined with increased demands for female participation in leadership. What practical effect this will have in policy changes in regard to women's peculiar problems is unclear.

CHAPTER VII

SOCIAL PROVISIONS

Ever since feminists, reformers, and union organizers have been writing on the question of female employment the question of social provisions has been raised. This is especially true when mothers have been involved. As Edith Abbott so ably pointed out in her pioneer work, Women in Industry,[1] women have always been involved in the labor market and, since the time of the Industrial Revolution, involved outside the home. Historically speaking, the most obvious social provision to be discussed was day care for children. Second, the question of hours was usually raised, with proposals for protection of women from overly long work periods and night work. Today the latter issue is considered not to be helpful to the betterment of women's status, while the first has maintained its relevance. In ever-more-technological society, the question of job training has become even more important and controversial. With more dispersed living and suburbanization of much of the population, the less affluent included, the problem of transportation to work has become a contemporary issue.

In this survey, after asking a series of questions designed to ascertain facts regarding the practices of SMSA employers in regard to part-time employment of women workers, an attempt was made to learn what social provisions are being offered, as well as employers' feelings of responsibilities towards women workers who are heads-of-families. Questions were asked as to what provisions were deemed necessary, and, in some instances, whom employers felt should be responsible for making them available. Questions were also raised as to whether changes in labor laws are advisable and whether governmental incentives might be offered to employers to take on some such women as part-time workers.

---

[1] Edith Abbott, Women in Industry (New York and London: D. Appleton, 1910).

This section will first report on employers' feeling of social responsibility in abstract terms towards the group of women under dicussion, minimally-skilled women workers who may wish to be employed part-time because of status as mothers. (Actually the survey instrument went further and specified that the women under discussion were heads-of-households who wished to work because of their responsibilities for family support). Employee's attitudes on specific social provisions will then be given. Finally, the matter of adequacy of relevant labor legislation will be reported upon.

Employers' Feelings of Responsibility

While there is a great deal of current interest in female employment, as evidenced by the high rate of return to this long and detailed questionnaire, little evidence exists as to whether employers have been translating this interest into their employment practices. Income figures, as gathered in the 1970 Census, indicate that in earnings women remain one of the depressed groups. In asking employers whether they believed it to be "socially desirable for companies (or institutions) to make an effort to hire, on a part-time basis, some minimally-skilled women who are heads-of-households" the objective was to give employers an opportunity to express themselves on other than strictly economic grounds. The following question attempted to obtain a more specific indication of whether the respondent might be willing to implement this opinion, if affirmative, and how. The second question was: "Who do you think makes the most suitable employer of women heads-of-households with minimal skills; private employers, government, government sponsored institutions, other?"

Response to this questionnaire indicates how strongly public opinion has changed in regard to the question of mother's employment. Eight hundred seventeen employers responded affirmatively to the question of the social desirability of mothers who are heads-of-households working. While some respondents indicated their perplexity by noting big question marks (and some 16 employers indicated qualified affirmative responses), 85% of the 965 employers who answered, answered affirmatively. This is 74% of all 1,110 respondents to the questionnaire as a whole.

Public versus Private

Curiously Public Sector employers feel slightly more positive about the merits of mothers' working when they head households than Private employers, 87% to 80% of the employers who answered the question.

Differences among Industries

By industry, the Textile group responded at a markedly lower rate than other groups, 32% while other groups ranged from the Chemical-and-allied industry's 60% to the Finance-and-insurance's 78%. It would appear from this data that those industries having the greatest experience with part-time women workers tend to think it is desirable for women who carry prime family responsibility to work. The Food-processors who go heavily for full time seasonal women workers are an exception. See Table 64.

TABLE 64

AFFIRMATIVE EMPLOYER OPINION AS TO THE SOCIAL DESIRABILITY OF WOMEN HEADS-OF-HOUSEHOLDS WORKING, BY INDUSTRY

Industry	Rate of Response
Trade	91%
Food-processing	86
Finance-and-insurance	85
Services	85
Apparel	80
Manufacturing	76
Chemical-and-allied industries	70
Paper-and-printing	68
Textiles	56

Public Sector Employers

Differences concerning Public Sector employers are characterized by the greater amount of positive feeling among the public service group than the public administration people. Curiously, the group feeling most positively were School employers, 93% affirmative.

Size of Payroll

Differences of feeling, by size, are negligible.

Summary

SMSA employers overwhelmingly believe that it is socially desirable for companies or institutions to make an effort to hire, on a part-time basis, some minimally-skilled women who are heads-of-households so that they could help support their families. Public Sector employers feel even more affirmatively about this matter than Private. Differences exist among industrial groups with those employers most accustomed to both women workers and women part-timers tending to be more positive than other groups.

In the Public Sector the health, education and welfare employers feel more positively than governmental employers. Size of payroll and location of facility do not explain employer reactions on this issue.

The Most Suitable Employer of Minimally-Skilled Women Workers who are Heads-of-Households

Although "government" is often pointed to as the most feasible "employer of last resort," and, more recently, as "employer of first resort" for disadvantaged workers, Greater Philadelphia employers do not appear to share this view. When asked whom they thought made the most suitable employer of women heads-of-households with minimal skills, a group widely publicized as being disadvantaged, only 11% of the responses indicated "government" as a choice. Rather, greatest interest was expressed in employment of this population in government-sponsored or funded institutions, such as hospitals, schools, or poverty programs. Almost as many favored private employment, as shown on Table 65.

TABLE 65

EMPLOYER OPINIONS ON THE MOST SUITABLE EMPLOYERS OF MINIMALLY-SKILLED WOMEN WHO ARE HEADS-OF-HOUSEHOLDS

Most Suitable Employer	Rate of Response (N=1,110)[1]
Government Sponsored or Funded..........	43%
Private Employers........................	41
Government...............................	11
Other....................................	5
Total....................................	100%

---

[1] Cross-tabulations show 178 respondents thought all potential employers should contribute to the employing of the group of women under discussion.

Public versus Private Sector Differences

Not unexpectedly there are differences in viewpoint between Private and Public Sector employers on this issue. Public Sector employers are much more likely to see government sponsored or funded programs as the likliest employers of disadvantaged women, while the Private Sector employers are more inclined to see the Private Sector as being more desirable. Very few in either group look to "government" as the most suitable employer, the percentages being practically identical--11%. See Table 66 for the comparison.

TABLE 66

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON THE MOST SUITABLE EMPLOYERS OF MINIMALLY-SKILLED WOMEN WHO ARE HEADS-OF-HOUSEHOLDS, BY TYPE OF EMPLOYER

Most Suitable Employer	Rate of Response	
	Private Sector (N=394)	Public Sector (N=611)
Government.................	11%	11%
Government-sponsored or Funded Programs.........	34	49
Private Employers.........	53	34
Other.....................	3	7
Total.....................	101%	101%

Percentages total more than 100% due to rounding. More than one response was permitted each employer.

There are further differences between Public and Private Sector attitudes. Twice as many Public Sector employers as Private indicated that all employers should contribute to the hiring of some women from the group under discussion, 22% to 11%. Some of the employers made their beliefs known by checking all possible answers to the questions, while others made notations to this effect.

Differences by Industry

Within the Private Sector group itself considerable differences exist between industries as to the place in the economy where these women might best be absorbed. See Table 67. With two exceptions (Manufacturing and Finance-and-insurance) employers within each industrial group thought that private employers were more suitable than public sector employers such as hospitals and poverty programs. However, differences in levels of such reportage were large, ranging from 41% to 68%. In the two instances where private sector employers believe government-sponsored or funded programs, hospitals, or poverty programs were the most likely place where these women could best be absorbed, differences were close.

Differences of opinion within the Public Sector group are also very large, with opinions regarding the Private Sector as the most likely employer ranging from 13% to 80% and government-sponsored or funded institutions, hospitals, etc., being designated as most suitable from 13% to 85%. See Table 68. Interestingly, public administration groups tended to see "government" as the most likely employer at higher rates than other Public Sector employers. Altogether, there are strong differences of opinion within the Public Sector as to whether the Private Sector or what amounts to the "public service" group in the Public Sector represents the most suitable place of employment for the group of women under discussion. On the overall basis the clear bias in favor of the public service area comes from the large number of Health agencies-and-institutions and Social agencies who feel strongly that the public service area is the best place of employment for this group of women workers.

TABLE 67

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON THE MOST SUITABLE EMPLOYER OF MINIMALLY-SKILLED WOMEN WHO ARE HEADS-OF-HOUSEHOLDS, BY INDUSTRY

Most Suitable Employer	Type of Industry								
	Apparel (N=40)	Chemical and allied ind. (N=28)	Finance and ins. (N=59)	Food processing (N=25)	Manufacturing (N=44)	Paper and printing (N=21)	Services (N=53)	Textiles (N=22)	Trade (N=97)
Private Employer	58%	54%	41%	56%	43%	48%	45%	68%	64%
Government	10	7	15	8	5	14	17	0	11
Government-sponsored Program	33	39	42	32	45	38	34	27	22
Other	0	0	2	4	7	0	3	4	2
Total	101%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	99%	99%

Percentages may total more than 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 68

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON THE MOST SUITABLE EMPLOYER OF MINIMALLY-SKILLED WOMEN WHO ARE HEADS-OF-HOUSEHOLDS, BY PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Most Suitable Employer	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Fed- eral (N= 53)	State (N= 46)	County (N= 26)	Muni- cipal (N= 23)	Colleges and univer- sities (N=40)	Health agencies and inst. (N=147)	Schools (N=85)	Social agen- cies (N=122)	Other (N=30)
Private	28%	50%	0%	44%	38%	13%	73%	1%	80%
Government	26	17	15	13	13	10	5	12	0
Government-sponsored or Funded Program	40	33	85	39	42	67	20	75	13
Other	6	0	0	4	8	11	2	12	7
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%	101%	100%	100%	100%

Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Size of Employer

Opinions on this subject do not appear to have any relationship to size of employer.

Summary

Employers of the Greater Philadelphia SMSA in great majority feel that it is socially desirable for mothers who are heads-of-households to work. Most employers see their sector of economy as the most desirable place to absorb these women. When asked where such women might be placed, the great majority favored either the Private Sector or the "public service" part of the economy, eschewing "government" as the most suitable employer (i.e., public administration). Private Sector employers tended to see the private sector as the most favorable place for absorption, while Public Sector employers tended to see the "public service" portion of the public sector as better. Within the Public Sector, employers in public administration favored their own groups at a higher rate than any other group of employers. Size of employer does not appear to be a factor in the formulation of these opinions, nor does county of location.

Some Social Provisions Relevant to Female Employment

Having established that Greater Philadelphia employers are thoroughly committed to the desirability of mothers and household-heads working and tend to think of their sector as the more suitable type of employer, do they translate these convictions into desire to offer social provisions which make (or might make) this a reality? What is being offered? What changes in labor law and what financial incentives might be offered to make such employment on a part-time basis more possible? The following will offer employer opinions as to where their employees are obtaining necessary job training at the entry-level, whether day care facilities are considered necessary for women who are heads-of-households to meet the expectations of a job, and, if so, who should offer them. Employers were also asked to report on the extent of public transportation available to their workers by day and night. Contacts with country welfare offices and WIN program supervisors on their perspectives of the transportation problem as it affects their clientele are also reported.

Job Training; Is it Necessary? Where is it Obtained?

The overwhelming majority of employers who responded to this survey believe that some skill-training is necessary for their entry-level employment. Only 11% of the responses indicated that their preference was for training offered by the employer. Table 69 shows that over a quarter of the responses indicate that "other" sources than those mentioned give the required training, implying a poor choice of options was offered by the questionnaire. Thirty-seven respondents wrote in comments suggesting alternative sources of education such as "high school," "fellow employee," "previous employer." Most important is the indication that neither MDTA-type government provided programs nor OIC-type programs[1] (which have their origin in Philadelphia) are seen as major suppliers of trained labor, and are recognized only by a few employers as being a source of their employee-training.

---

[1] Opportunities Industrialization Centers, a Negro-self-help organization which is in large part government funded.

TABLE 69

EMPLOYERS' REPORTS OF SOURCES OF TRAINING FOR ENTRY-LEVEL EMPLOYMENT

Source of Training	Rate of Response (N=1,342)[1]
Employer	46%
Government-sponsored or Funded Training Programs	10
Government Training Programs	6
Other	27
No Training Required	11
Total	100%

More than one response was permitted

Public versus Private

In regard to training sources, Private and Public Sector employers report different experience. Public Sector employers are less inclined than Private to believe that no training is needed. Also Public Sector employers are less apt to train their own employees than are Private entrepeneurs. Public Sector employers use workers from both government training programs and government-sponsored or funded programs at much higher rate than the Private employers. Finally, Public employers report alternative sources of employee-training at a much higher rate than the Private Sector. In other words, when employer responses are controlled for type of employer, the preference of the Private Sector employer for training his own employees stands out to the extent of dwarfing of all other responses. It is also of interest to note that 15% of all employers in the Private Sector reported "no training required" for their entry-level employment. See Table 70.

---

[1] Some employers indicated more than one source of training. Thirty-seven additional responses indicated high school, previous employer, and fellow employee as possible sources of training.

TABLE 70

EMPLOYERS' REPORTS ON SOURCES OF TRAINING FOR ENTRY-LEVEL EMPLOYMENT, BY TYPE OF EMPLOYER

Source of Training	Rate of Employer Response	
	Private Sector (N=475)	Public Sector (N=867)
Employer..................	57%	41%
Government-sponsored or Funded Programs.........	4	12
Government Training Programs................	3	7
Other.....................	21	30
No Training Required......	15	10
Total..................	100%	100%

More than one response was permitted

Response by Industry

In examining employer responses by industry, it may be seen that industries differ considerably in their appraisals of the need for some training and in the extent to which they designate "employer" as the chief source of job training. Employers varied from 9% (Apparel industry) to 25% (Textiles) in their conviction that no training was necessary for their entry-level work. In regard to non-employer-provided training programs, the Textile and Apparel industries are notably more interested in government-funded training programs than any other group. See Table 71.

In the Public Sector, the public administration group is less apt to report "no training" needed than employers in the public service group. They are also less apt than the public service employers to report that the employer gives the training. Government training programs are reported at higher rates than in the public service group. "Other" sources of employer training are also reported at very high rates in public administration. See Table 72.

TABLE 71

EMPLOYER REPORTS ON SOURCES OF TRAINING FOR ENTRY-LEVEL EMPLOYMENT, BY INDUSTRY

Source of Training	Type of Industry								
	Apparel (N=54)	Chemical and allied ind. (N=36)	Finance and ins. (N=20)	Food processing (N=21)	Manufacturing (N=72)	Paper and printing (N=25)	Services (N=58)	Textiles (N=28)	Trade (N=77)
Employer	59%	56%	49%	70%	50%	60%	55%	46%	69%
Government Sponsored or Funded Programs	9	3	5	0	6	0	3	11	0
Government Training Programs	6	3	4	0	4	4	2	4	1
Other	17	25	31	15	25	20	28	14	7
No Training Needed	9	14	11	15	15	16	12	25	23
Total	100%	101%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

More than one response was permitted.

TABLE 72

EMPLOYERS' REPORTS ON SOURCES OF TRAINING FOR ENTRY-LEVEL EMPLOYMENT, BY PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Source of Training	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Federal (N= 51)	State (N= 51)	County (N= 62)	Municipal (N= 30)	Colleges and universities (N=47)	Health agencies and inst. (N=321)	Schools (N=41)	Social agencies (N=250)	Other (N=41)
Employer	26%	20%	40%	20%	30%	45%	46%	45%	50%
Government-Sponsored or Funded Program	12	22	15	13	13	12	2	13	14
Government Training Program	12	12	8	13	4	7	0	7	0
Other	47	39	29	40	43	26	34	26	28
No Training Needed	4	8	8	13	11	11	17	9	7
Total	101%	101%	100%	99%	101%	101%	99%	100%	99%

More than one response was permitted. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

Size of Employer

In the Private Sector, there is an inverse association between the size of employer and rates at which employers report no training needed for their entry-level employment. The very smallest employers report at the 25% level while the largest employers so report at the 15% level. Private Sector employers in the very largest size category report themselves as the source of their employee training at a lower level than any other group. See Table 73.

In the Public Sector, employers in the larger size categories, 300-and-over, tend to report no training needed less frequently than those with less-than-300. Also, smaller employers, those with fewer-than-500 employees, tend to report employer-provided job training at higher rates than larger. The very largest Public Sector employers report employer-provided training at considerably lower rates than other size groups, about 25%. Larger employers, in line with the above, are more apt to cite "other" sources of training than smaller ones in the Public Sector. See Table 74.

Response by County

On the county basis, the two counties containing the cities which are the hubs of the SMSA and the Camden Labor Area, respectively, Philadelphia and Camden, both report employers as the source of training at the lowest rates (41% and 40%, respectively) while all but one other county so report at least at the 50% level. Again, with the exception of one other county, Philadelphia and Camden Counties report government training programs as the source of employee training at higher rates than others. Philadelphia, along with the three counties comprising the

TABLE 73

EMPLOYER REPORTS ON SOURCES OF TRAINING FOR ENTRY-LEVEL EMPLOYMENT, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PRIVATE SECTOR

Source of Training	Size of Payroll					
	1-24 (N=124)	25-49 (N=52)	50-299 (N=133)	300-499 (N=41)	500-999 (N=50)	1,000-or-more (N=75)
Employer	59%	62%	60%	54%	54%	47%
Government Sponsored or Funded Program	2	0	6	2	6	8
Government Training Program	3	2	2	4	4	5
Other	15	19	17	30	26	29
No Training Needed	21 100%	17 100%	15 100%	10 100%	10 100%	11 100%

More than one response was permitted

TABLE 74

EMPLOYER REPORTS ON SOURCES OF TRAINING FOR ENTRY-LEVEL EMPLOYMENT, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PUBLIC SECTOR

Source of Training	Size of Payroll					
	1-24 (N=232)	25-49 (N=137)	50-299 (N=284)	300-499 (N=48)	500-999 (N=80)	1,000-or-more (N=86)
Employer	39%	46%	45%	44%	35%	26%
Government Sponsored or Funded Program	15	9	13	6	11	13
Government Training Program	8	5	7	4	10	8
Other	28	31	27	33	34	38
No Training Needed	10 100%	9 100%	8 100%	13 100%	10 100%	15 100%

TABLE 75

EMPLOYER REPORTS ON SOURCES OF TRAINING FOR ENTRY-LEVEL EMPLOYMENT, BY COUNTY

Sources of Training	Pennsylvania Counties					Camden Labor Area		
	Philadelphia (N=533)	Bucks (N=91)	Chester (N=119)	Delaware (N=124)	Montgomery (N=231)	Camden (N=126)	Burlington (N=60)	Gloucester (N=58)
Employer	41%	52%	51%	53%	53%	40%	50%	43%
Government Sponsored or Funded Programs	12	5	7	6	4	14	13	12
Government Training Programs	8	2	3	2	3	10	3	9
Other	27	22	27	29	27	25	30	24
No Training Required	12	19	12	9	13	11	3	12
Total	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	99%	100%

Camden Labor Area, report government-funded programs as the source of training at higher rates than the Pennsylvania Suburban Counties. See Table 75.

Summary

The great majority of employers who responded believe that some skill-training is necessary for their entry-level employment. Of the various sources of training offered, employers reported training offered by themselves at higher levels than that offered by government or government-sponsored or funded programs. Alternative sources of training were indicated by many employers. Public Sector employers are more apt to believe training is required than Private Sector employers and less apt to do the training themselves. There are very considerable differences among industries and among the various Public Sector employers in regard to their training sources. There is also some relationship between training sources and size of payroll, with the largest employers reporting employer-provided training at lesser rates than other size groups. In the Private Sector there is an inverse association between size and rates at which employers report no training needed for their entry-level employment. Private employers in the very largest size category report themselves as the sources of training at a lower rate than any other group. The counties containing the City of Philadelphia and the City of Camden, the hub of the SMSA and of the Camden Labor Market portion of the SMSA respectively, report employer-provided training at lower rates than the other counties. With one exception these two counties are also the largest users of government training programs, reflecting the large MDTA and other on-job-training programs running since the early 1960's in these centers.

Public Transportation; its Relationship to Employment

The availability of public transportation as a factor in employment of disadvantaged groups came to public attention in the late 1960's when the public was frustrated by the seeming inability of planners to make expanding suburban job opportunities available to Negro inner-city dwellers. Public attention was focused on the inequities of a public transportation system seemingly geared to delivery of suburban commuters to and from their central city work addresses. Reverse transportation for ghetto dwellers was said to be far less effectual and not the objective of the transport system. A 1967 article in the Monthly Labor Review[1] documenting the transportation problems of inner-city dwellers attempting to reach the new suburban industrial parks attracted public attention and some remedial activity as part of the War on Poverty.

Because of the reputed relationship between employment opportunities and availability of public transportation, employers were asked in this survey whether they consider public transportation adequate, limited, or nonexistent, by day and by night, for purposes of reaching their facilities. This section will present employer responses on the availability of public transportation, supplemented by material obtained through personal interviews with public welfare and public employment service officials, as well as data provided by the 1970 Census and the studies of the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission and the Delaware County Welfare Department.

The questions to be addressed below are: What is the level of adequacy of existing public transportation? Does transportation affect employment of the women in question i.e., is there any way of knowing how such women get to work when they do obtain employment and how the quality of the work they obtain is affected by the transportation factor? Third, by what means other than public transportation are women workers who are not car owners getting to the job?

---

[1] Dorothy Newman, "The Decentralization of Jobs: Job Opportunities in the Suburbs out of Reach of the Center-City Poor," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 90, No. 5, (May, 1967), pp. 7-13.

Survey Data

Of the 1,033 employers who replied to this question. 592 (57%) said that their public transportation, by day, was "adequate," 259 (25%) said it was "limited," and 182 (18%) said there was "none." Most of the employers also responded regarding night-time transportation: 279 (29%) of the 953 who answered said that the question was non-applicable since they did not have night shifts; 293 (43%) of the remaining 674 employers said their night-time transportation was "adequate;" 198 (29%) said it was "limited," and 183 (27%) said there was "none."

Public versus Private Experience

Public Sector and Private Sector employers reported almost identical situations regarding availability of transportation as presented above.

Differences by Type of Public and Private Sector Employer

Some industries report greater transportation problems than others. When the data for industries reporting "limited" public transportation are combined with that reporting "none" whatsoever, the outlook in many fields is grim for would-be-workers without cars. As may be noted from Tables 76 and 77, the Manufacturing field as well as the Chemical-and-allied industries report particularly high

TABLE 76

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION, BY DAY, BY INDUSTRY

Availability of Transportation	Type of Industry								
	Apparel (N=46)	Chemical and allied ind. (N=31)	Finance and ins. (N=60)	Food processing (N=23	Manufacturing (N=59)	Paper and printing (N=19)	Services (N=47)	Textiles (N=24)	Trade (N=90)
Adequate	63%	45%	80%	48%	29%	53%	72%	46%	66%
Limited	17	19	13	26	29	21	22	25	24
None	20	36	7	26	42	26	6	29	10
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 77

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION, BY NIGHT, BY INDUSTRY

Availability of Transportation	Type of Industry								
	Apparel (N=36)	Chemical and allied ind. (N=29)	Finance and ins. (N=56)	Food processing (N=20)	Manufacturing (N=55)	Paper and printing (N=19)	Services (N=41)	Textiles (N=20)	Trade (N=76)
Adequate	22%	17%	32%	40%	9%	21%	42%	45%	49%
Limited	3	7	20	10	16	37	12	4	30
None	8	48	11	25	42	21	5	20	17
Non-applicable No Night Work	67	28	37	25	33	21	41	31	4
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 78

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION BY DAY, BY PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Availability of Transportation	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Federal (N= 41)	State (N= 33)	County (N= 49)	Municipal (N= 18)	Colleges and universities (N=38)	Health agencies and inst. (N=215)	Schools (N=30)	Social agencies (N=192)	Other (N=13)
Adequate	81%	61%	29%	67%	45%	63%	33%	57%	46%
Limited	12	33	39	33	32	22	40	28	31
None	7	6	32	0	23	15	27	15	23
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 79

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION, BY NIGHT, BY PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Availability of Transportation	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Federal (N= 39)	State (N= 29)	County (N= 43)	Municipal (N= 17)	Colleges and universities (N=34)	Health agencies and inst. (N=207)	Schools (N=30)	Social agencies (N=185)	Other (N=12)
Adequate	15%	21%	12%	53%	24%	40%	17%	31%	8%
Limited	8	3	19	12	24	33	27	18	33
None	8	7	28	18	21	20	20	17	17
Non-applicable No Night Work	69	69	41	17	31	7	35	34	42
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

levels of transportation lacks by day and night. Food-processors, Textiles, and the Paper-and-printing industry employers also report no public transportation at high levels by night. In the Public Sector, as may be seen from Tables 78 and 79, County employers report serious lacks of public transportation by day and night. When reports of no transportation are combined with those of limited transportation, it may be seen that, in many Public Sector fields, the numbers of employers reporting limited or no public transportation are greater than those reporting adequate transportation. This is true of County employment, Colleges-and-universities, and Schools. Many Health agencies-and-institutions make such reports at high levels.

The Size Factor

Those workers who find employment in the very largest plant of 1,000-and-more employees will have an easier time getting to work than other employees, whether by day or night. By day, while there is some variation between employers by size in regard to reporting of "adequate" transportation (48% to 58%), there is no consistent pattern. The very largest employers are quite out of line with the rest, 73% reporting adequate transportation by day. By night the largest employers also report adequate transportation at highest rates, but by night there is a strong, consistent association with size, with the smallest employers reporting adequate public transportation at the 25% level and the largest at the 45% level.

There is no relationship between the rate at which employers report "limited" public transportation by day and size of employer. However, the largest employers, as would be expected, report limited transportation least often, at about a 15% rate while other size groups report at the 24% to 28% levels.

TABLE 80

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION
BY DAY, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL

Availability of Transportation	Size of Pavroll					
	1-24 (N=280)	25-49 (N=163)	50-299 (N=328)	300-499 (N=72)	500-999 (N=92)	1,000 and over (N=98)
Adequate	58%	56%	55%	48%	56%	73%
Limited	28	26	24	26	27	15
None	14	19	21	26	17	12
Total	100%	101%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 81

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION BY NIGHT, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL

Availability of Transportation	Size of Payroll					
	1-24 (N=256)	25-49 (N=130)	50-299 (N=286)	300-499 (N=79)	500-999 (N=91)	1,000 and over (N=102)
Adequate	25%	32%	30%	27%	37%	45%
Limited	17	22	21	25	25	22
None	12	23	24	24	19	17
Non-applicable No Night Work	46	23	25	24	19	16
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

There is no relationship between employer reportage of "no transportation" and size of employer. However, there is a very marked inverse association between size and those who report no night work i.e., inapplicability of the questions on night transportation. Forty-six per cent of the smallest employers answering the question reported no night work while only 16% of the largest employers so reported. See Tables 80 and 81.

Thus, women who work for larger employers are more likely to be asked to work at night than those who work for smaller employers, but they also have a better chance of obtaining night-time public transportation.

The Counties

Only in Philadelphia County--considered 100% urbanized by the 1970 Census indicators--do a large proportion of SMSA employers, consider public transportation adequate for purposes of getting to the job.

As may be seen from Table 82, Philadelphia employers overwhelmingly believe that transportation is adequate (92%), but in Camden County, which is considered 96% urbanized by the same indicators, only 63% of the employers consider day time public transportation adequate. Bucks and Chester County employers report adequate transportation at the lowest rates in the 8-counties. In this light it is interesting to note that these counties report very large amounts of population change in the decade from 1960 to 1970, 34.5% and 32%, respectively.[1] Burlington County, in the Camden Labor Area, which also reports adequate day time transportation at very low rates, 22%, also has experienced

---

[1] U.S. Bureau of the Census, Vol. 1, Characteristics of the Population, Op. Cit., p. 24.

TABLE 82

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION BY DAY, BY COUNTY

Availability of Transportation	Pennsylvania Counties					Camden Labor Area		
	Philadelphia (N=397)	Bucks (N=77)	Chester (N=97)	Delaware (N=99)	Montgomery (N=180)	Camden (N=81)	Burlington (N=54)	Gloucester (N=48)
Adequate	92%	13%	17%	48%	41%	63%	22%	35%
Limited	6	42	40	34	35	23	45	46
None	2	45	43	18	24	14	33	19
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

very high population increases, 44% in the decade 1960 to 1970. Gloucester County, in the Camden Labor Area, reports adequate day time transportation at the next lowest rate, 35%. Gloucester has experienced great population increases, 28%, and is considered only 71% urbanized. Thus, employer reports of the adequacy of day time transportation by county, seem related to the occurrence of considerable population change within the county in the recent past. As will be shown later, even counties which have not experienced a great deal of population change in gross numbers may have experienced important internal shifts in population which, together with shifts in the location of industry, make for transportation difficulties. Delaware County, which is 97% urbanized by Census standards, is a case in point. It experienced only 8.5% population increase, but has had great internal changes which have ramifications for less affluent citizens who need public transportation to get to a job.

Only 7% of Philadelphia employers report limited day time transportation, but elsewhere, all other SMSA counties report lacks in their transportation situation at heavy rates. Even in heavy urbanized Camden County, 23% of the employers report limited transportation. In the other counties of the SMSA, no less than about one-third of the respondents reported limited day time transportation.

Lacks in night time transportation are a serious matter for persons without cars who do shift work. Only in Philadelphia County and in Camden County do more than 14% of the respondents report adequate night time transportation. Even in Philadelphia, only 58% of the employers thought their night time transportation situation adequate. And, even when existent, "the quality of the transportation is a factor," as one irate head of a large restaurant chain stated.

TABLE 83

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION BY NIGHT, BY COUNTY

Availability of Transportation	Pennsylvania Counties					Camden Labor Area		
	Philadelphia (N=374)	Bucks (N=66)	Chester (N=86)	Delaware (N=94)	Montgomery (N=171)	Camden (N=74)	Burlington (N=48)	Gloucester (N=40)
Adequate	58%	6%	9%	15%	13%	30%	6%	10%
Limited	13	29	15	28	26	27	33	25
None	2	47	48	20	32	9	33	18
Non-Applicable No Night Work	27	18	28	37	29	34	28	47
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In 5 of the 8-SMSA-counties, from 20% to 48% of the respondents report that no public transportation exists at night which would enable workers to get to their jobs. At the same time, from 18% to 47% of the employers in the 8-counties stated that the lack of night time transportation does not affect them since they do not have evening hours. See Table 83. These statistics at best can only be indicative of the broad spread of the problem since, clearly, even if some public transportation exists to a given industrial plant or state hospital, this transportation will not be equally available to all persons who may wish to obtain employment in this facility. Likewise, the degree of urbanization of a county, as designated by the Census Bureau, does not indicate that there may be large areas within a heavy urbanized county which have no public transportation nor any industry or other source of jobs to which would-be workers may look for possible employment.

Impressions of Public Officials

County welfare officials, WIN program coordinators, and state employment service workers who were contacted agree that, except for Philadelphia, transportation is an important variable determining client employability. In two SMSA counties, Burlington in the Camden Labor Area, and Bucks in Pennsylvania, the transportation-employment problem has been compounded by the building of public housing developments in isolated areas, according to WIN program coordinators. The welfare clients who flock to obtain the cheap housing effectively remove themselves from the possibility of employment in many instances. In Upper Bucks County, characterized as "rural" by welfare officials, disadvantaged would-be workers ask for jobs, but have to be brought into the welfare or state employment service offices by Human Service Aides or by neighbors who are paid to do so.

Employment is hardly a reality for many since no public transportation in their area exists except for a bus line which goes into Philadelphia. Persons living in towns in the more heavily populated and industrialized Lower Bucks County area may not be able to accept jobs within their own town because of lack of intra-town public transportation. The same situation was reported in Chester County (Pennsylvania) and Burlington County (New Jersey). In Gloucester County (New Jersey) many persons live on farms which may be over a mile distant from a bus stop. The limited bus service which exists reportedly does not offer reliable transportation sufficient to meet the expectations of a job. Women in the New Jersey "Working Poor" Program are believed to get to such plants as CBS Records through car pools (Officials of the company have confirmed this to the investigator). State employment service officials report that many persons presently living in the Camden Labor Area must commute to other counties to obtain employment.

In Camden County where the Camden Labor Area welfare load is concentrated, welfare officials say that transportation does not loom as a major problem, Rather, lack of jobs is the major issue. However, there was general agreement that, should the job market for the minimally-skilled open up, transportation would emerge as a critical issue. A community organizer within the Black Community in Camden reports that, even within the aging City of Camden itself (102,000 population), the largest urban unit in the Camden Labor Area, only very limited transportation exists within the area (a high speed line and train carry passengers across the Delaware River into Philadelphia). Large numbers of Blacks concentrated in large housing projects in one area of Camden City have access to only one bus line which offers limited coverage and infrequent service.

Philadelphia City-County offers considerable bus, subway, and train transportation, especially during daytime hours. According to county welfare officials, transportation problems are limited to the peripheries of the city. The problem in Philadelphia is more related to cost, quality, and safety, especially during the nighttime hours. A number of employers volunteered that women workers express fear of working at night and that the mere existence of public transportation does not reflect its actual availability to women workers. The local news media frequently mention fears of using subways at night. College students working at night as cab drivers have reported to the investigator that many customers at night are workers forming "cab pools" to get to and from their jobs in lieu of other transportation.

Census Data

In 1970 Census data[1] on types of transportation used to get to the job within the Greater Philadelphia SMSA offer further insights. While the data presented can not prove that welfare recipients and other would-be workers could not get to a job if they tried harder, it tends to re-enforce the opinion of WIN and other welfare officials that transportation lacks are excluding many potential and willing workers in the welfare population from employment.

The majority of women, 16 to 44, in the SMSA, the group corresponding closest to the group whose needs are under discussion, both live and work outside central city areas in the SMSA. Of the 400,000 women (16 to 44) in the SMSA labor force, over half (57.1%) live outside the central city areas. Of these quarter million women, 77% also work outside central city areas. The huge majority of these women commute to work by private car. Car poolers are surprisingly few--only 17.6% of these 175,000 women, and only 5.9% of this group use public transportation. While Philadelphia employers in large numbers believe there is adequate transportation to their facilities, large numbers of women either choose to use private transportation or find it necessary to do so. Almost half of the 170,000 women living in central city areas of the SMSA (which means mainly Philadelphia and the City of Camden) drive to work. Only 52.7% use public transportation. Of those who reach work in a private car, two-thirds go as the driver; car poolers account for only about one-third of the private car occupants. (For a breakdown of modes of transportation of women workers in the SMSA, see Table 84).

---

[1] U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of the Population, Detailed Characteristics; Final Report PC (1) D 32, New Jersey, (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972), Table 190.

Much has been written about the problem of central city workers in reaching employment in the burgeoning suburban job markets. Some 16,000 women travel to the suburbs from central city areas in the SMSA, only one-third using public transportation. About one-half of the 16,000 use private cars to get to work; only about one-quarter of the private car riders are car poolers, as of 1970. A reasonable conclusion from the above is that the main body of the labor force (represented here by women workers, 16 to 44) work either when public transportation is available or when private car ownership is possible. Not very many women in the central city areas are traveling outward-bound as a result.

It is also possible that little incentive exists for women to travel to suburban areas for purposes of employment if comparative wage rates are an indication. Mean wage rates for women inside and outside the central city areas of

TABLE 84

MODES OF TRANSPORTATION OF WOMEN WORKERS (16-44) IN GREATER PHILADELPHIA SMSA

	Women Workers in the SMSA (N=398,294)	Modes of Transportation		
		Public Transportation	Private Car Passenger	Private Car Driver
Women Workers (16-44) living inside Central City (cities)	43%			
working inside central city	33%	53%	N=133,328 11%	22%
working outside central city	3	34	N=15,969 16	44
working outside SMSA of residence	1	38	N=3,903 16	26
place of work unreported	5	66	N=30,701 12	22
Women Workers (16-44) living outside Central City Areas	57			
working in central city areas	8	46	N=32,507 16	36
working in SMSA outside central city	41	6	N=175,095 17	66
working outside SMSA of residence	4	9	N=21,509 21	70
place of work not reported	5	18	N=24,629 20	62
	100%			

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of the Population: 1970, Detailed Characteristics, Final Report, PC(1) D 32 New Jersey (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972), Table 190.

the SMSA are so similar, as given by the 1970 Census, that central city women would appear to be unlikely to improve themselves by expensive, time-consuming travel to suburban areas. In fact, center city women using public transportation to get to suburban areas in some instances earn less than their sister city workers. All work for very little--mean earnings fluctuating around the $4,000 mark. See Table 85.

The 1970 income data published by the Census Bureau[1] suggest that, while unavailability of public transportation probably inhibits many center city women from trying their luck in the suburbs, the women with the highest earnings are the women who work in central city business areas, whether they be city dwellers or suburban commuters. (The same is true for the Negro portion of the female work force). The next best earnings are a comparatively modest number of women working in the central cities, but not in the central city business districts, who live outside the central cities. This may be explained by the larger proportion of white women with education who live in suburbia. This is true, again, for Negro women, considered separately. Thus, employment in central city business districts is the most financially rewarding of all available female employment for other than well educated suburban women.

Employment and Transportation in Delaware County

In a report of Delaware County Board of Assistance personnel who are involved in job placement activities it is stated that many welfare recipients can not be placed at all because of the transportation problems in the County, considered 97% urbanized by Census standards.[2]

---

[1] U.S. Bureau of the Census, Op. Cit.

[2] John Bauer, Op. Cit.

TABLE 85

MEAN EARNINGS OF WOMEN WORKERS (16-44) IN THE GREATER PHILADELPHIA SMSA, BY PLACE OF WORK AND RESIDENCE

	Number of Women Workers (16-44) in SMSA (N=398,294)	Mean Earnings
Women Workers (16-44) living inside Central City Business District	43%	$ 3,856
working inside central city business district	5%	4,226
elsewhere in central city (cities)	28	3,899
outside central city	3	4,200
working outside SMSA of residence	1	3,990
place of work not reported	5	3,101
Women Workers (16-44) living outside Central City (cities)	57	3,608
workers inside central city business district	2	5,048
elsewhere in central city (cities)	6	4,802
working in SMSA outside central city	41	3,424
working outside SMSA of residence	4	3,946
place of work not reported	5	2,777
	100%	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of the Population: 1970, Detailed Characteristics, Final Report, PC(1) D 32 New Jersey (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972), Table 190.

Although Delaware County is itself a satellite of Philadelphia, within the County a shift of industry has occurred. Industry, according to the report, had been concentrated along the southern portion of the County where public transportation existed, but has now shifted to the western and northern borders where there is none. Therefore accessibility to an automobile has become a necessity for job placement in the experience of the Welfare staff.

Even where some transportation exists, service is so infrequent or limited outside of daytime hours during the work-week that many persons who work odd hours, night shifts, or week-ends have serious problems. This lack has often interfered with the acceptance of a job. Some efforts have been made by public transportation authorities to remedy this situation through experimental bus routes which were not successful. As a remedy for a limited number of welfare recipients who desire to obtain employment, the County authorities have started a driver-education program so that automobile transportation may become possible. This would hopefully have the effect of enabling some welfare recipients to reach the new jobs in the suburban areas for which they might have qualifications. The majority of jobs created by the shift of business and industry have been in light manufacturing and retail stores. While most of the employable public assistance recipients could qualify for these jobs, in the views of the welfare placement personnel, they often do not have the skills or education to meet the entry-level requirements for jobs in larger industries which are generally more accessible to public transportation.

Walking to Work

The analysis of the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission which specializes in transit planning confirms much of the above.[1] While the Commission sees dependence upon automobile transportation as continuing to increase, having gone from 55% to 68% in the decade since 1960, it offers some revealing insights into an alternative means by which workers are reaching their place of employment, walking. Data extracted from 1970 Census tapes indicate that large numbers of workers still use this method. In the City of Philadelphia 74,000 workers do just this. In the two other heavily urbanized Pennsylvania counties in the SMSA, about 15,000 workers in each walk to work. In two other SMSA counties as many as 9,000 workers in each walk. However, walking to work appears to be a decreasing option in these counties where it is most prevalent. The Delaware County Board of Assistance commentary i.e., that workers are increasingly being separated from potential employers by relocations, suggests why. However, in Philadelphia where it is most prevalent, walking to work has decreased only slightly as a means of transportation. This documented capacity of a large number of the labor force to reach work independent of the availability of public or other transport indicates that center city residents without cars are not necessarily as disadvantaged as suburban and rural residents who also lack such access. Curiously three counties which are experiencing rapid industrialization are reporting an increased prevalence of "walkers." Perhaps the introduction of new industry is, in effect, bringing work where possibilities of employment never existed before. Local farmers and town dwellers may sometimes be able to walk to some of the new plants.

---

[1] Delaware Valley Data, Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, No. 6 (January, 1973), p. 1.

Home Work as an Alternative

Discussions of mothers' dilemmas in reconciling employment with home responsibilities sometimes still prompt suggestions that home work be developed for such women.[1] The D.V.R.P.C. data indicate that, in light of present trends, this approach is increasingly less promising. Totally urbanized Philadelphia which has some 26,000 home-based workers, experienced a 48% decrease in the last decade. Rapidly industrializing Burlington County in the Camden Labor Area experienced an 88% decrease in the same period. In Burlington County the 25,000 home workers who gave up home work are probably farm families shifting to new opportunities. The concurrent spectacular rise in "walkers-to-work in Burlington County, a 303.3% increase, supports the view that farm families are turning to jobs which are now appearing in their immediate environs due to the location of new industry. The other counties reporting large decreases in home-based work are also counties with large rural areas (Gloucester, N.J. and Chester County, Pa.). Whether the female component of the home worker group would show the same trends as the entire work force remains unknown.

Location of the AFDC Caseload

How does the transportation situation described in this section affect disadvantaged women who are would-be workers? One measure is the effect on the AFDC population. The great concentration of the AFDC caseload in the SMSA is in Philadelphia (67,246 cases) and in the City of Camden (12,723 cases). As stated earlier, in Philadelphia daytime transportation does not appear to be a factor in inhibiting

---

[1] One of Klausner's recommendations in his recent Camden study is that cottage industry be encouraged. Klausner, Op. Cit., p. xix.

employment. In Camden the situation is less clear, both in terms of the degree to which transportation is available for some segments of the population. A portion of the Black population in housing projects within the city is supplied only by very limited transportation.

The welfare loads in the other counties of the SMSA not mentioned above are unimpressive numerically (Bucks, 3,988 cases; Chester, 2,096 cases; Delaware, 6,160 cases; Montgomery, 2,753 cases; Camden Labor Area; Burlington, 2,569 cases; Gloucester, 1,832 cases), but present severe problems in job placement in individual terms since transportation is much more likely to be unavailable in the environs than in Philadelphia or the City of Camden. Only one county welfare official who was contacted expressed optimism about the ability of would-be women workers to overcome the transportation problem. In the experience of this official, women reached work through car pools "if they really wanted to." However, that this option is open to all disadvantaged women is questionable. As Klausner has concluded in his recent study of welfare mothers and working poor mothers in Camden and environs, womeh who work are likely to have friends, relatives, and associates who work, while women on welfare are likely to have social relationships with persons in similar circumstances.[1] If this situation applies to life in the suburban counties, it would be a plausible speculation that the most disadvantaged women would have difficulties in obtaining rides from their would-be associates.

All the counties in the SMSA have WIN programs, as mandated by the Talmadge Amendments. However, except for

---

[1] Klausner, Op. Cit., p. ix.

Philadelphia and Camden Counties, problems in implementing these programs due to transportation problems are recounted by WIN coordinators and other officials. While many of the WIN enrolees are involved on a voluntary basis, often they can not benefit from WIN programs as they live in an "exempt" area i.e., one in which the nearest WIN training facility is more than one hour's distance by public transportation. Thus many women are denied the possibility of participating in upward-mobility type programs by merit of being in subruban counties with disadvantaged populations either too small or too dispersed for training programs to be set up. The "working poor" programs in New Jersey also exempt potential workers where they live too far from the central training centers. Th woman who lives in a suburban county in the SMSA loses out both in regard to participating in the job market as it is or in engaging in job training which might enable her to develop skills for better jobs because of the transportation factor.

Summary

Transportation is one of the most important social provisions enabling would-be women workers to participate in the labor force. While much public attention has been directed towards the frustrations of inner city dwellers attempting to reach new jobs in suburban and industrial park areas, the data produced by this survey indicate that public attention needs to be directed towards the problems of disadvantaged persons living in suburban counties. These people have less opportunity to obtain public transportation to possible places of employment than the central city dwellers in the SMSA. Even intra-town transportation is absent in many cases. And many persons have no possibility of obtaining employment except by traveling by automobile to other counties. Census data on income offer no reason to believe that women workers in the center-city areas could better themselves economically by traveling to suburban jobs. County welfare officials, including WIN program coordinators, are in consensus that transportation problems defeat the intent of this program in many localities and deny women in the suburban counties the possibility of participating in training programs.

The response to this survey shows that a majority of employers, 57%, believe day-time public transportation to be adequate for their purposes, 25% say it is limited, and about 18% say there is none. By night the picture is more restricted, with about 29% of those answering saying that they had no need for night time transportation; almost half of the remaining said it was adequate, while less than one-third said it was limited, and slightly fewer said there was none. Differences were found in availability by industry, with opportunities for entering the Manufacturing field and the Chemical-and-allied industries especially limited for reasons of transportation. This was also true of county employment in the Public Sector and has applicability to most other Public Sector employment. Very large employers are more accessible by means of public transportation than other groups. When analyzed by county, a much grimmer picture emerges as most of the accessible employment exists with the hub-city of Philadelphia and, to a lesser extent, in the City of Camden, the hub of the Camden Labor Area. There appears to be a relationship between the degree of recent population change and lack of adequate transportation. However, even counties with small population increase may suffer from industrial shifts which deprive the population of old area opportunities to obtain employment. Delaware County is the case illustration used.

Walking to work is one means by which workers do defeat transportation lacks. However, this is not promising as a way out of present dilemmas as it appears to be diminishing in the suburban counties, especially those in which large population change has occurred.

Day Care as a Mothers' Employment Facilitator

Day Care as a Necessity?

In recent years day care has been very much in the news as a social provision necessary if mothers of young children go to work. It is also seen as having positive meaning to the children involved. In this survey SMSA employers were asked to express their beliefs regarding day care in terms of this service being a necessity to help women be better employees rather than in humanitarian terms. On this basis 87% (841) of the 969 employers answering indicated that they did see day care facilities for children as necessary "so that women who are heads-of-households can meet the expectations of a job." Public Sector employers were slightly more convinced than Private, but differences were not great, 88% to 82%.

Response by Type of Employer

Some industries are more convinced than others of the necessity of day care in terms of meeting the demands of a job. Only about three-quarters of the Food-processors, Paper-and-printing industry, and Manufacturers hold this opinion, while 90% of the Apparel industry and the Finance-and-insurance institutions take this position. In the Public Sector public administration expresses more conviction than the public service sector, with a range of 90% to 94%. In the public service sector Social agencies are predictably most convinced about the necessity of day care. The nature of the responses to this query on day care do not appear to be related to the extent to which an industry or institution hires women workers. No group other than Colleges-and-universities (78%) reported less than 88% of its respondent employers so convinced.

Response by Size of Payroll

Employer opinions regarding the desirability of day care appear to be influenced by size, an inverse association appearing to exist between size and affirmative opinion. The smallest employers feel that day care is necessary at the 91% level while the largest so indicated at the 83% level. The same relationship held when the data were controlled for type of employer, Public or Private.

Response by County

Philadelphia employers are among the least convinced that day care is necessary while Camden employers are the most convinced. Thus no consistency exists between employer attitudes and status as an old-established industrial center.

Who Should Provide the Service?

While employers appear to have very strong positive feelings about the necessity of day care for good performance, this is not translated into a mandate for employer action. Only a very small percentage of employers believe they should offer day care. See Table 86. Rather, employers are fairly evenly divided in their views as to whether day care should be self-provided, offered gy government or alternatively, by private social agencies. Only 23 employers indicated a belief that all these sources should contribute to meeting the need.

Public versus Private Response. The Public and Private Sectors hold different views on the question of day care provision. The Private Sector is much more inclined to

TABLE 86

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON SUITABLE SOURCES OF DAY CARE PROVISION

Source of Day Care	Rate of Response (N=1,453)
Self-provided	33%
Private Social agencies	30
Government	28
Employer	9
Total	100%

More than one response was permitted

believe women should provide their own day care facility, less convinced that government should provide, and less convinced that the employer should participate. Only 5% of all Private Sector responses favored employer responsibility. Table 87 shows the differences in point of view on this issue between the Public and Private Sectors.

TABLE 87

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON SUITABLE SOURCES OF DAY CARE PROVISION, BY TYPE OF EMPLOYER

Source of Day Care	Rate of Response	
	Private Sector (N=468)	Public Sector (N=985)
Employer	5%	11%
Government	24	31
Private Social agencies	28	31
Self-provided	43	27
Total	100%	100%

More than one response was permitted to an employer

Differences by Type of Employer. Differences exist among the industrial groups, but in all cases more employers in each group are in favor of self-provision of day care service than any other method of obtaining the service. The

Chemical-and-allied industries and the Finance-and-insurance industries have especially low levels of opinion that the government should offer the service. Otherwise the various industries do not show great differences between convictions that, after self-provision, government and private social agencies should take responsibility for meeting this need.

In the Public Sector a different picture emerges. Among the nine groups studied, only two showed more interest in the mother providing her own care than any other method. Four were most interested in provision by government, while two groups exhibited the most interest in provision by private social agencies.

Size of Payroll. When the data are studied by size, of employer, while marked trends do not exist, it is interesting to observe that the largest employers in the Private Sector show markedly less interest in self-provision of day care than the others, 33% opting for this means of provision, while other size groups expressed themselves at the 42% to 49% levels. Also, the largest employers showed markedly more interest in provision of day care by the employer than others, 13% while the smaller size groups ranged from no interest at all to 5%.

In the Public Sector an entirely different picture emerges. There is a positive association between employer opinions on self-provision of day care and size of payroll. The smallest employers are least convinced of this approach (21%) while the largest opt for this means at the highest rate (35%). Again, when the question of provision by government arose, employers of fewer-than-300 employees were more sympathetic than the larger employers. Differences, however, are not great.

Summary. SMSA employers overwhelmingly believe that day care is necessary for mothers to meet the expectations of a job. They are fairly evenly divided over who should offer the service--self, government, or private social agencies. As a whole they favor self-provision. Very few believe that employers should offer this service. There are considerable differences between Public Sector and Private Sector employers on this issue, with the Public Sector employers being more evenly divided on the above options than the Private Sector where a definitely larger proportion are in favor of self-provision. In the Private Sector, great differences do not appear among the various industrial groups on this issue. The Public Sector employers, however, show a broad divergence in views, with most favoring either government provision or provision by private social agencies. There is some relationship between size of employer and attitudes toward day care provision, especially in the Public Sector where there is an inverse association between size and belief that day care should be taken care of by the mother herself. While few Private Sector employers believe the employer should be the provider of day care service, the largest employers are more sympathetic than other groups.

Adequacy of Labor Legislation

Employers do not believe that labor laws stand in the way of their undertaking the hiring of women workers on a part-time basis. Private employers see less problem than do Public Sector employers. Eighty-seven per cent of the Private employers saw no problem, while only 68% of the Public Sector ones did.

Problems of Unemployment Compensation

While employers may not be cognizant of problems in regard to legislation concerning part-time employment, workers themselves suffer from less-than-full status when facing separation from a part-time job. According to the Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment Security, the Pennsylvania Unemployment Compensation Law meets Federal standards by demanding that persons requesting Unemployment Compensation be "fully committed to the labor force." This has been interpreted by courts over the years as meaning that an applicant be "able and willing to accept full time employment." Court challenges over the years have resulted in some deviations being made in regard to part-time employment which has resulted from an involuntary situation. However, never, in the knowledge of the Philadelphia Bureau of Employment Security, has a deviation been made in regard to voluntary part-time work availability. No class action suit has been filed to date testing the legitimacy of part-time employment for mothers as full commitment to the labor force, as demanded by Federal standards.

Since the Federal government sets the standards which states strive to meet for purposes of reimbursement, one approach to remedying the current inequitable situation facing women part-time workers is to seek revision of the Federal provision that all applicants be "able and available" for full time employment. It would not be unreasonable to request modification of this provision for mothers involved in child-rearing on the grounds that availability for part-time employment in addition to carrying of home responsibilities on behalf of a family may represent full commitment to the labor force for these women. Another approach is state-by-state challenges on a class action basis as to the interpretation of the "able and available" for work clause.

The Problem of Pension Exclusion

Another problem in law is the International Revenue Code provision which permits pension funds to get favorable treatment even though they exclude "employees whose customary employment is for not more than 20 hours in any one week and employees, whose customary employment is for not more than five months in any calendar year." In anticipation of the current legislative interest in pension reform, a prominent editorial writer for the New York Times, in bringing these facts to attention, called for changes in the law which would require that part-time and part-year work result in proportional pension benefits. This is of particular importance since only about 2% of widows collect a private pension, according to this writer, while about one-third of all women who work, work part-time.[1]

Financial Incentives; Subsidies?

Because government can make a particular form of employment more or less attractive through inducements or prohibitions, an attempt was made to learn whether employers believe specific changes in labor legislation are required to make part-time employment of women attractive to them. More specifically, employers were asked whether some form of subsidy would be necessary as an incentive to make such employment possible on a steady basis. As will be seen, no such impediments to the hiring of women part-timers were discernible to employers. The disabilities which exist are from the supply point of view. Furthermore, employers are disinterested in subsidies in terms of the kind of positive incentive which government might offer to encourage part-time hiring of women under discussion.

Various types of financial incentives to hire disadvantaged groups have been proposed and implemented in recent years. In this survey, employers were asked if a

---

[1] William Shannon, New York Times, September 10, 1973.

37

"government subsidy" would be necessary to make possible the employment of women heads-of-households on a steady part-time basis. The response indicated an overwhelming rejection of the concept. Of the 971 employers answering, 804 or 81% rejected the idea. Only 24 (6%) of 381 Private Sector employers responding were interested, while 128 (22%) of the 590 respondent Public Sector employers expressed an interest. Some of these Public Sector employers noted that they were already receiving such subsidies.

Size of Payroll

Of the 152 employers who gave affirmative responses[1] there is an inverse association with size, with the smallest employers displaying the highest rate of interest; 28% of the smallest employers answering, 64 in number, were interested.

When the Private Sector employers were asked, secondly, if they might be interested in a subsidy for their own establishment only 18 responded affirmatively, all of them in the "under-300" employee size groups.

Summary

Very few employers who responded to this survey are interested in government subsidies as a means of enabling them to hire female heads-of-households on a steady part-time basis. Since many of these employers are already hiring such women part-time and, often on a steady basis, the overwhelming negative response must be seen as a rejection of the subsidy concept. Private employers overwhelmingly reject the concept, while some Public Sector employers accept it, a few pointing out that they are already receiving subsidies.

---

[1] There were an additional 15 affirmative responses of a qualified nature.

Benefits; a Subject Requiring Study

The question of benefits in relation to the part-time worker is a major issue. It affects the worker's true rate of remuneration in relation to full time workers; it affects the employers' decision to hire; it has an important influence on union attitudes toward this hiring practice. This survey has neglected this area, a serious failing. Undoubtedly a study of the benefits aspects of the part-time employment phenomenon would lead to recommendations for remedial legislation.

Other Legal Obstacles

Contacts with all the seemingly relevant state and Federal agencies dealing with labor affairs failed to uncover any further legal obstacles to the use of part-time work arrangements or the equitable treatment of such workers. Since many agencies have not carefully considered the problems of the part-time worker, this does not mean that such legal obstacles or disabilities do not exist.

CHAPTER VIII

PUBLIC SECTOR ISSUES: CIVIL SERVICE AND PARAPROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS

The Civil Service Issue in the Employment of Disadvantaged Groups

Because government on all levels is often thought to be the most likely potential employer of disadvantaged groups, the question of obstacles allegedly posed by Civil Service regulations and administration is of particular interest. In the context of this inquiry Civil Service regulations, practices, and limitations were investigated to better understand what problems would exist if a recommendation to accelerate public sector hiring of minimally-skilled women were to be made.

Governmental Policies in the SMSA

Federal, state and county officials have been contacted to learn (a) whether a Civil Service system exists within their domain, (b) whether part-time workers are on their payrolls, and (c) what their policies and practices are in regard to non-standard hours. Second, inquiry was made in the Public Sector survey instrument as to whether (a) would-be women workers with minimal skills might have problems complying with requirements and, if so (b) what some of the problems would be.

The first effort, effected by a telephone survey of Civil Service and/or personnel officials on various levels of government in the SMSA revealed the following: Civil Service exists on the Federal level and, to a large extent, on the state levels, both in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. (In Pennsylvania a new state-wide union contract involving the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal workers is laying the basis for a greatly expanded Civil Service since patronage will be done away with). Pennsylvania counties, for practical purposes, have no Civil Service. The counties in the Camden Labor Area all have their own Civil Service systems, as provided for optionally by New Jersey law. Some municipalities and school districts also have their own systems in New Jersey. In Philadelphia City-County, 32,000 of the 35,000 employees are under a merit system, according to the city personnel office.

Federal Policy

Of all levels of government, only the United States Civil Service System has a positive written policy in regard to part-time employment. As was readily admitted by a local official, this written statement is all the Federal Government has. The subject of part-time employment is discussed in the Federal Personnel Manual (April 30, 1971) in the context of employment ceilings which (along with the "Federal freeze") have been interpreted by agencies as reason for not taking on part-timers.

The Manual indicates that there are a number of personnel slots open for each agency beyond the ceilings established for full time, temporary, and intermittent workers. The Manual states that the Office of Management and Budget holds that "if persons seeking regular, permanent, part-time jobs have been told it is impossible to offer this kind of employment because each position of this kind must be charged against the full time permanent ceiling, they have been incorrectly advised. . . ." However, if there are not enough jobs in the non-full time permanent ceiling, "an attempt should be made to accomodate the part-time employee within the full time permanent ceiling." According to the Manual, the Office of Management specifically states it will favorably consider permitting agencies to split full time jobs so that no penalty will accrue to the agency in lost manpower slots. The Federal Personnel Manual concludes by quoting both the Office of Management and Budget and the Civil Service Commission as strongly urging that "government agencies make employment available to women who can work only part-time. . . ."

According to the local Federal Administrator who was contacted, the reason that the investigator received so many negative responses from Federal agencies is that they incorrectly count their part-time employees against their permanent employment ceiling and therefore would rather have full time employees occupying all their authorized slots. A perusual of 17 letters received from Federal agencies who declined to complete the questionnaire indicates that only one specifically states that part-timers would take away manpower by occupying full time slots. Ten Federal employers simply state that they do not hire part-time; an additional agency said the same, adding that the agency did not hire part-time "because of the nature of the operation." Three more stated they were "not authorized" to so hire. One agency said it hired many regular part-time or intermittent workers, enclosing a brochure in lieu of completing the questionnaire. Another (military) said no women were hired at all, while a civilian agency reported that, while it hired part-time, it had to hire a person with prior Civil Service status. In several of the above cases, smallness of the unit was cited as a reason for not taking on part-timers.

State Policies

A spokesman for the Civil Service of the Pennsylvania Commonwealth took a very pessimistic view towards part-time employment on the state level. While part-time work is not specifically prohibited, there is no need for it, according to this source; "most jobs work out to be full time." The spokesman conceded that agencies and institutions could hire part-timers if they so wished, but did not foresee such a possibility arising.[1]

A New Jersey Civil Service spokesman indicated that no formal program exists by which part-time persons are hired, nor is adequate information available as to practice. An isolated state hospital, unable to secure help, may split a stenographer's job and never inform the Civil Service Commission. A few part-time employees are to be found in most governmental offices, largely as in-house accommodation to the needs of either a hard-to-get skilled worker or a long-time employee who must be home with children.

County Policy

In none of the four suburban Pennsylvania SMSA counties is there a Civil Service system. None indicate any preference for part-time employees. Where a few exist, some receive benefits on a pro-rated basis; others not. Some of these four counties do hire workers on an intermittent basis when demand is highest. There was an agreement that most part-time employment is clerical in nature. One county calls its women employees "part-time" because they work from 9:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. Some counties obtain workers from temporary help agencies, as needed.

---

[1] Until recently, the Pennsylvania State Liquor Store System hired part-time clerks. At present state institutions hire some doctors and other health personnel part-time. According to the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Workers' Union, the union represents some part-time workers in the state hospital system and elsewhere.

In New Jersey where state law provides that, upon popular referendum, counties and units of local government can have Civil Service systems run by the state, all three SMSA counties have such systems. According to the New Jersey Civil Service Administrator for Southern New Jersey, about 3% of all the 20,000 jobs he supervises are part-time positions of the type being studied in this investigation. He actively recruits and accepts part-time workers for situations where (a) a full time worker is not needed, or (b) where the skill is high (largely medical and dental) and not enough money is available to hire a full timer. The law provides that part-time persons must work the equivalent of 84 full working days before having to take a Civil Service test. Responses to advertisements for part-time work are very good. Mainly, advertisements are for tax billing or cleaning chores.

In the opinion of the local government administrator, counties and other units of local government are poorly informed in regard to their rights under Civil Service. Many believe that appointing a person on a part-time basis automatically cuts off either the agency or the person from Civil Service. Probably much part-time hiring goes on which the local government administrator does not know about. Part-timers may be paid by vouchers so that Civil Service may not be aware that either the job or the person exists.

In the three New Jersey counties of the SMSA, all define part-time as "twenty hours or less a week." The New Jersey County personnel officers appear more comfortable in discussing part-time employment than their counterparts in the Pennsylvania counties. Camden County reports about 100 part-time positions out of 1,700 (which includes all county employees except the Welfare Department). Many of the 100 part-timers are medical or other health related personnel. After passing examinations, a part-timer may achieve permanent status and can become a full time employee later on.

In Burlington County about 25 to 30 of the 970 county positions are part-time.[1] Part-timers are hired only when a full timer can not be found. County institutions and agencies are free to hire part-time workers, according to a county personnel spokesman, but the positions, under Civil Service, must remain part-time. Examples of hard-to-fill positions are library system employees, food service workers, and the several types of nurses. One position may be split between the workers. College students are seen as likely candidates for such slots.

In Gloucester County about 20 to 25 out of 500 regular county employees (exclusive of the Welfare Department) are part-timers, according to the county personnel office. These employees seldom receive permanent status and do not qualify for benefits. Those who average 20 hours per week may receive some fringe benefits such as medical insurance, vacations, and sick leave. As in the other New Jersey counties of the Camden Labor Market, part-time employment is undertaken reluctantly in special situations where it is not possible to obtain full time workers.

---

[1] There are 74 other county positions among which the presence of part-timers is unknown.

Conversations with officials and personnel officers in the above three Camden Labor Area counties tend to confirm the Civil Service local government administrator's comments that counties either consciously develop policies which are inhibitory to the hiring of various groups, or misinterpret State Civil Service regulations as being the inhibitor of innovation. When they do engage in such hiring, it is often on the basis of non-standard conditions which leave the part-time employee in a disadvantageous position.

Municipal Scene

The only large city in the SMSA is Philadelphia where 32,500 of the 35,000 employees are under a nominal merit system. There is no written statement in the city personnel manual regarding part-time employment. Unofficially it is not regarded as a good personnel practice. A study is to be made of current part-time personnel (mostly medical, dentists, and nurses) with a view towards eliminating the practice. One job which is peculiarly adapted to part-time employment and will continue, is that of school crossing guard. Thus, while the City of Philadelphia is the largest single employer in the 8-county SMSA, its official personnel policies show no social orientation in regard to meeting the needs of many women for non-standard hours.

An explanation for the insensitivity to the needs of women workers is offered by one of the two city Councilwomen. This Councilwoman states that patronage is still the most important factor in obtaining city employment. While women hold as many as one-third of the positions on some ward committees, in many wards there are "very few." Male ward leaders are not prone to recommend women for jobs. The Councilwoman believes entry-level positions for women to be "pitiful," and part-time work to be the exception; but had no supporting data. Her perception of part-time employment for women coincided with that of the city personnel office. Neither the Councilwoman nor a union representative for the city workers know how many women actually are among the 35,000 city employees. According to both Councilwomen, women's attempts to secure better paying jobs are frustrated by such devices, as telling them they "will be contacted," "are not qualified;" applications get lost. Since the city scale wage is high, the entry-level pay scale being $6,356, city jobs are considered highly desirable. Women's chances to secure these highly sought positions lie in increased political activism at the ward level, according to the activist-oriented Councilwoman quoted above. The same would have to be said for a more sympathetic part-time employment policy.

Survey Data

An attempt was made in this survey to elicit information regarding Civil Service as a factor in employment of the minimally-skilled on the part of the Public Sector employers who are covered by a merit system. The volume of response to this query as well as the data collected must be regarded as unsatisfactory. Many respondents in the Public Sector did not answer and, where they did, the nature of the response indicated a misreading of the query. The problem in this case, was clearly fatigue caused by the position of the question at the end of a long questionnaire and faulty wording of the initial question. In addition, options offered regarding possible problems may have been unsatisfactory.

Civil Service a Problem in Hiring?

The initial question regarding Civil Service which was posed was, "If your agency or institution is covered by Civil Service, would part-time women workers have difficulty complying with Civil Service regulations?" From comments and other indications in the subsequent responses, it is apparent that many respondents misread this question as, "Do you or do you not have Civil Service coverage?" The data, therefore, were corrected in some instances where the meaning was clear; in a few cases phone calls were made. However, the figures below still can not be said to necessarily reflect an accurate response to the question which was intended . . . "Is Civil Service a problem in your efforts in hiring the disadvantaged?" The response as partially corrected for obvious errors is shown on Table 88.

TABLE 88

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS, PUBLIC SECTOR, CONCERNING CIVIL SERVICE AS A PROBLEM IN THE HIRING OF DISADVANTAGED WORKERS

Type of Response	Percentage (N=672)
Affirmative	11%
Negative	11
Does not Apply	18
No Response	60
Total	100%

Of these figures, the one which is most reliable is the figure on non-applicability, for 118 respondents wrote in, "does not apply," which is taken to mean that no Civil Service coverage is involved in their agency or institution. This may also be true of many of the 408 respondents who did not reply at all. The affirmative and negative response, whatever its meaning, split almost evenly.

Type of Public Sector Employer. While reserving judgment as to what respondents understood the question to mean, it may be reported that, of the employers actually answering (i.e., those replying affirmatively, negatively, or "does not apply") to the question as to whether part-time women workers would have problems in complying with Civil Service regulations, 44% of the Federal employers answered affirmatively, 69% of the State, 39% of the County, and 71% of the Municipal. The responses in the public service sector were much lower: 21% of the Colleges (only 3), 7% of the Health agencies-and-institutions, 5% of the Social agencies (3), but 27% of the Schools (11), some of which are school districts. Of the 118 respondents who wrote in "does not apply," large numbers are concentrated among the Colleges, Social agencies, and Health agencies-and-institutions.

Reaction by Size. The two largest size employer groups, those with 500-employees-or-more, answered affirmatively at slightly higher rates than smaller employers. Twenty-three per cent to 29% of the employers in the various smaller employer groupings answered affirmatively, while about 36% of the employers of 500-or-more workers did so.

Differences by County. The affirmative responses varied greatly by county, from 67% in Gloucester County to 10% in Delaware. The very low level affirmative response from Delaware County may be explained by the strong political control in that County. However, explanation for the great variation among other Counties does not readily appear. In general a higher percentage of affirmative responses came from the Camden Labor Area than from the Pennsylvania portion of the SMSA.

Possible Difficulties

Response to a series of possible difficulties in hiring of minimally-skilled women, as Civil Service regulations and practices are involved, is shown in Table 89.

TABLE 89

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS, PUBLIC SECTOR, ON PROBLEMS RELATED TO CIVIL SERVICE IN HIRING OF MINIMALLY-SKILLED WOMEN WORKERS

Problems Related to Hiring Minimally-Skilled Women Workers	Rate of Response (N=346)
Lack of Suitable Positions............	15%
No Provision for Part-time Work.......	13
Inability to Pass Tests Competitively.	8
Lack of Suitable Job Descriptions for Paraprofessional Positions......	3
Non-applicable........................	56
Other.................................	5
Total.............................	100%

Three hundred twenty-six of the 672 Public Sector employers did not answer the question at all. Many may have been Health and Social agencies-and-institutions uncovered by any Civil Service system as most exist outside government.

As may be seen, of the 346 responses, 193 Public Sector employers out of a potential 672 noted that the questions regarding Civil Service were inapplicable to their situation. It is assumed that this means that their agencies-or-institutions are not covered by Civil Service. It is also assumed that this is true of those among the 672 Public Sector respondents who did not answer at all.

Of the modest number who answered, the largest response, 53 (or 15% of the responses to the question) was to the option "lack of suitable positions." Forty-four (13% of the responses) employers believe that lack of provision for part-time work "is a factor in hiring," while 27 (8%) indicated concern regarding "inability to pass tests competitively." Five per cent cite "other" problems.

Type of Employer. Public administration employers report problems at higher levels than public service employers, largely because more workers are probably covered by Civil Service. In one case Schools also reported problems at a high level (lack of suitable positions). Of those who answered, 98% of the responses of Social agencies, 84% of the Health agencies-and-institutions, 70% of the Colleges-and-universities, and 42% of the School opinions volunteered the information that the questions were inapplicable to them, which is taken to mean they are uncovered by Civil Service.

Not enough public administration employers responded to draw any meaningful conclusions as to differences in types of problems they experience with Civil Service. See Table 90.

Reactions by Size of Payroll. The very large and very small employers offer different reactions to possible problems regarding Civil Service. The employers of 500-or-more workers report problems related to inability to pass examinations competitively at about double the rates of smaller employers. See Table 91. The same employers also report the lack of suitable positions at a much higher rate than the smaller employers (23% to about 12% to 16% in other size groupings). The employers of fewer-than-50 employees report the problem of suitable job descriptions at a higher rate than the larger employers, but very small numbers are involved, It may be noted that, of the 193 employers who noted "non-applicable" to this question, the employers of 500-or-more workers are represented at markedly lower rates (34% to 38% of the response) than the employers

TABLE 90

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS, PUBLIC SECTOR, ON PROBLEMS RELATED TO CIVIL SERVICE IN HIRING OF MINIMALLY-SKILLED WOMEN, BY TYPE OF PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Type of Problem	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Federal (N= 31)	State (N= 49)	County (N= 35)	Municipal (N= 19)	Colleges and universities (N=20)	Health agencies and inst. (N=89)	Schools (N=87)	Social agencies (N=12)	Other (N=4)
Inability to Pass Tests Competitively	19%	18%	11%	11%	5%	3%	17%	0%	0%
Lack of Suitable Job Descriptions for Paraprofessionals	10	8	17	0	0	2	8	1	0
Lack of Suitable Positions	29	33	26	37	15	6	25	1	0
No Provision for Part-time Work	23	37	20	31	10	3	8	0	0
Other	16	2	6	10	0	2	0	0	0
Non-applicable	3	20	20	11	70	84	42	98	100
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 91

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS, PUBLIC SECTOR, OF PROBLEMS RELATED TO CIVIL SERVICE IN HIRING OF MINIMALLY-SKILLED WOMEN, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL

Type of Problem	Size of Payroll					
	1-24 (N=106)	25-49 (N=59)	50-299 (N=104)	300-499 (N=17)	500-999 (N=30)	1,000 and over (N=30)
Inability to Pass Tests Competitively	7%	8%	6%	0%	13%	17%
Lack of Suitable Job Descriptions for Paraprofessionals	6	12	4	0	3	3
Lack of Suitable Positions	16	8	13	12	23	23
No Provision for Part-time Work	14	15	7	12	20	17
Other	1	2	7	0	3	7
Non-applicable	56	55	63	76	38	34
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%

of fewer-than-500 workers (55% to 76% of the response).

Reactions by County. In response to specific problems under Civil Service relating to the hiring of minimally-skilled women, the Camden Labor Area employers report problems at a much higher rate than Pennsylvania employers.

Summary. Of the various employers in public administration only the Federal government has a positive (though unimplemented) written policy in regard to part-time employment. State, County, and Municipal officials and personnel workers believe part-time employment to be undesirable. They engage in it only when (a) the job does not require full time people or (b) the skill is so rare or expensive that it can only be obtained on a part-time basis (usually the Health related professions). Beliefs of State, County, and local government employers that Civil Service regulations prohibit or impinge on their ability to hire non-standard hours are usually based on misinformation and misinterpretation of regulations. Part-time employment is generally believed to be a poor personnel practice, sometimes resorted to for economic reasons, often the avoidance of benefits payments.

The survey data collected in regard to Civil Service problems are unsatisfactory due to frequent misinterpretations of the initial question and possible inadequacies in the options offered in a following detailed question. It does appear, from the data collected that lack of suitable positions and lack of provision for part-time employment are seen as two prominent obstacles to the hiring of minimally-skilled women under Civil Service (full or part-time).

Paraprofessional Programs as Potential Hirers

Because New Careers programs and paraprofessional training efforts have proliferated in the last few years as a means of aiding disadvantaged workers in pursuit of upward mobility, Public Sector employers were asked about their experience with part-time workers in regard to special government programs aimed at helping disadvantaged women at the entry-level. The thought was to ascertain whether Public Sector employers had become involved in such programs and what their status was at the time the survey was conducted, November, 1972. Since paraprofessional programs tend to be related to periods of program expansion, the questions asked were geared to this consideration. Very specifically, an effort was made to see whether any part-time employment was taking place in these programs since most of the persons involved in New Careers are women, many of them mothers. The response to the specific questions asked was modest in number and evoked few supplementary remarks or letters. This may have been (a) because the questions were not the pertinent ones which should have been asked or (b) related to their position at the end of a lengthy, detailed questionnaire.

The wording of the question on paraprofessional programs was as follows: What factors other than labor market considerations affect your ability to hire minimally-skilled women on a part-time basis? (a) employment guidelines by government funding agencies requiring hiring of disadvantaged or client populations, (b) availability of Federal funds for public service-type jobs, (c) redesign of professional jobs to provide opportunities for paraprofessionals, (d) program expansion, (e) present oversupply of paraprofessionals, (f) other, (g) none. Of the 672 Public Sector employers who returned the questionnaire, the largest number to answer any one of the above questions was 176. Multiple responses were permitted.

The Public Sector employer responses are as shown on Table 92.

TABLE 92

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS, PUBLIC SECTOR, ON NON-LABOR MARKET FACTORS AFFECTING MINIMALLY-SKILLED WOMEN WORKERS

Non-Labor Market Factor	Rate of Response (N=823)
Program Expansion	21%
Availability of Federal Funds for Public Service Type Jobs	16
Present Oversupply of Paraprofessionals	15
Problems Involving Job Redesign to Provide Opportunities	13
Employment Guidelines Requiring Hiring of the Disadvantaged	8
Other	7
None	20
Total	100%

A large number of respondents wrote in the comment, "non-applicable," in response to this question. Because of a high level of confusion and coding error around this notation, the number of such comments is not being reported.

Type of Employer

When the responses of the various public sector employers were examined, it was found that the public administration and public service sectors tend to answer at different levels. In regard to the need to conform to employment guidelines requiring hiring of paraprofessionals or client populations, the Federal, State and County employers show more interest than the public service sector. The School employers, many of them representing public school districts, also show more interest than other public service employers such as Colleges and universities, Health agencies and institutions, and Social agencies. See Table 93. The public administration group is also much more interested and affected by the availability of Federal funds for public service-type jobs than the public service sector. There is an uneven, unpatterned response to the question of job redesign as a problem in opening up new employment to paraprofessionals. Schools are most interested in this issue. When the issue was couched in terms of program expansion (or lack of) affecting the ability to hire, Schools and Social agencies registered the highest levels of interest. Colleges-and-universities and State employers show the most concern in regard to a possible oversupply of paraprofessionals. This is of particular interest since Health professions, including both health manpower planners in Federal agencies located in the Philadelphia area and personnel in Health institutions themselves, have told the investigator of current oversupplies of paraprofessionals in the health field. Yet the response of the Health agencies-and-institutions to such query was mild.

Size of Employer

Size of employer is not helpful in explaining employer experience and opinion regarding problems related to hiring for paraprofessional, New-Careers-type jobs. Chiefly, the analysis by size reveals that the problems of the largest employers of 1,000 and more have been left unarticulated at a much higher rate than those of other size groups. Seventeen per cent of the largest employers reported "other" in relation to non-market-type problems related to hiring minimally-skilled women, while the range in other groups is from 5% to 9%. In regard to hiring being inhibited by lack of program expansion, the two largest size groups of employers, 500-and-more, reported this at lower rates than other groups. The employers of fewer-than-300 workers state that the availability of federal funds is a problem in hiring at slightly higher rates than larger employers. In regard to the problem of an over-supply of paraprofessionals limiting present hiring, these employers report this at slightly higher rates than smaller employers. Differences are small.

County Differences

In general, consistent differences by county do not appear. However, in regard to the problem of lack of program expansion inhibiting new hiring, Philadelphia and Camden Counties report this at lower rates than other counties, though differences are not great, around 18% as opposed to about 21% to 27% in other counties, In regard to the availability of federal funds for hiring for public service-type jobs, Camden reports this to be a factor at a much higher rate than other counties, 22% as compared to a range of 13% to 17% in other counties.

Summary

Public Sector employer responses to questions of non-market considerations in hiring minimally-skilled women was very modest, indicating either poor articulation of the factors involved or respondent fatigue since the question appeared near the end of a long questionnaire. Greatest interest was expressed in the problem of program expansion, followed by indication of problem in regard to availability of federal funds for public service-type jobs and the present oversupply of paraprofessionals.

Although Health manpower planners and administrators had advised the investigator of the existence of a serious oversupply of paraprofessionals, the modest response of the Health agencies-and-institutions to this question indicate that oversupply must not be a burning issue. Of the 224 Health agencies-and-institutions who returned the questionnaire, only 38 noted this issue as a problem. As may be seen from Table 93, this represents about the same level of interest which the Health group showed in problems related to job redesign and program expansion.

TABLE 93

EMPLOYERS' OPINIONS ON NON-LABOR MARKET FACTORS AFFECTING ABILITY TO HIRE MINIMALLY-SKILLED WOMEN WORKERS, BY PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Non-Labor Market Factor	Type of Public Sector Employer								
	Federal (N= 55)	State (N= 51)	County (N= 73)	Municipal (N= 28)	Colleges and universities (N=41)	Health agencies and inst. (N=202)	Schools (N=52)	Social agencies (N=247)	Other (N=14)
Availability of Funds for Public Service Jobs	29%	25%	19%	36%	17%	11%	13%	15%	0%
Employment Guidelines Requiring Hiring of the Disadvantaged	18	14	15	11	2	5	10	5	7
Present oversupply of Paraprofessionals	18	24	11	14	24	15	10	14	21
Problems Involving Job Redesign to Provide Opportunities	7	8	15	0	10	15	21	13	7
Program Expansion	16	16	18	21	20	15	30	30	14
Other	0	8	6	7	2	10	14	5	7
None	12	5	16	11	25	29	2	18	44
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Size of employer is a poor mode of analysis for explaining differences in responses as is county of location.

The nature of the response to this question indicates that it probably was not successful either in articulating the most important issues involved in the question and was so near the end of the questionnaire as to raise the question of whether respondent fatigue is a factor.

While many letters were received from employers, both Public and Private Sector, regarding many issues in the survey, none referred to this question regarding paraprofessional programs. Few comments were written in by persons who answered the questions except the few who wrote in the comment, "money!" Of those who did not answer, a very large number wrote in the comment, "non-applicable." In view of the large number of Health agencies-and-institutions and Social agencies represented among the 672 Public Sector respondents, most must have come from these two groups. This must be taken as indication that a large number of these institutions, all considered to be good target groups for development of paraprofessional programs, are either uninterested or untouched by the New Careers paraprofessional movement. Clearly much work will need to be done, first in arousing interest, and second, in providing the carrot by means of a large scale funding of institutional programs in general and paraprofessional programs in particular before much hiring could take place, a dubious prospect in view of current trends.

CHAPTER IX

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This Chapter will state the major findings, conclusions, and recommendations stemming from this 1972 survey. It will begin with reference to the original hypothesis and subsequent findings, followed by statement of some important questions which were originally posed and findings. A second section presents some conclusions garnered from the inquiry. A third section states some recommendations concerning the future use of part-time employment as a means of enabling women workers who are heads-of-households to attain work status and the benefits associated with such status.

Implications of the study concerning the present state of knowledge, the need for future research and theory building, and for social policy are stated at appropriate points.

Findings

Survey Hypothesis Reviewed

1) Attitudes and practices of greater Philadelphia employers are critically influenced by the type of industry, size of payroll, and geographic location.

It was found that practices and attitudes were indeed critically influenced by the type of industry involved. Some industries produce much more part-time hiring than others, see different benefits in the practice, and vary in their optimism concerning the future of part-time employment. Type of industry also affects how employers view the possibility of expanding stable employment to cover more part-time workers.

Geographic location has some impact, but not critical influence, on practices and attitudes concerning part-time employment. Pennsylvania SMSA employers report more part-time hiring than employers in the New Jersey portion, while suburban employers report more part-time hiring than employers in Philadelphia and Camden Counties, the old urbanized centers of the SMSA. This is particularly true in the New Jersey portion of the SMSA. Attitudes of employers concerning issues involved in part-time employment are also affected by location.

Size of payroll has only a very modest affect on the practice of part-time hiring. The very smallest employers, those with fewer-than-25 workers, engage in less part-time hiring than larger employers. This is particularly true in the Public Sector.

2) Greater Philadelphia employers who currently employ part-time female workers are in the clerical, sales, and service fields.

The above is found to be incorrect. The heaviest employers of women part-time workers in the Private Sector, Trade, Finance-and-insurance, and Services, more frequently report the presence of part-time workers on their payrolls than other industrial groups, but part-time hiring is prevalent throughout the nine industrial groups studied. The least likely to be hiring women, the Chemical-and-allied industries, reported 37% engaging in some part-time hiring. While undoubtedly many women employed part-time are clerical workers, since occupational categories of part-time workers were not explored in the survey instrument, there is no data as to the job classifications into which part-time workers fall.

3) Industries who presently hire women part-time are those requiring peak-load coverage, are seasonal, or those considered to be marginal operations.

Peak-load coverage does indeed prove to be the major motivation for hiring of part-time women workers, in terms of alternatives posed by this study. If the benefits question had been pursued it might have proven to provide as powerful or more powerful a motivation. While some seasonal employers, such as Food-processors, are big hirers of part-time workers, employers more frequently report offering steady part-time work or report that job stability "depends on the job." Part-time employment is prevalent in all types of businesses. Since small businesses would tend to be considered more likely to be marginal than large, the fact that part-time employment is more a phenomenon associated with larger employers indicates that part-time employment is not associated with marginality.

4) There is little interest among Greater Philadelphia employers for establishing a pattern of steady part-time employment for minimally-skilled women.

Employers were quite optimistic that it would be possible to establish a pattern of stable part-time employment for women workers in their own plant. When asked, however, what additional shifts they might be willing to consider and the nature of such new shifts in terms of job stability, few had stable new shifts in mind.

5) Union objections and demands making part-time employment financially disadvantageous are a major deterrent to establishment of non-standard work-days or work-weeks in both Private and Public Sectors.

This does not appear to be the case. Union attitudes toward part-time employment differ by industry.

Some unions have no position because they claim "the problem has not surfaced" in their field. In others it is a way of life, seen as being mutually beneficial to both employer and workers. One prominent union stated part-time employment is unwanted by both parties. Some Public Sector unions explained that they would find ways of negotiating mutually satisfactory accommodations if part-time employment became more prevalent in government.

Financial disinducements is only one of a number of ways by which unions deal with part-time employment where it is seen as problemsome or not to be tolerated.

6) Most private employers are disinterested in government subsidies as an inducement to hire some women part-time.

Both Private and Public Sector employers overwhelmingly rejected the concept of subsidy as an inducement for hiring.

7) Small employers in the Greater Philadelphia SMSA presently use part-time help more often than large, but large companies are more willing to consider alternative hiring patterns.

It was found that the smallest employers, those with fewer-than-25 employees, are less likely to be hiring part-time workers than employers of larger numbers. This is more pronounced in the Public Sector than in the Private. At the same time the data do not support the view that large employers are more likely to be willing to innovate than smaller. However, the employers of 25-or-more workers appear more confident in regard to the offering of steady employment than the smallest.

The only issue on which the very largest employers appear more willing than others to consider new approaches is on the expansion of job-sharing among women.

8) Employers in the Private Sector are more flexible in their willingness to consider hiring some women workers part-time than employers in the Public Sector.

Private employers taken as a group, report part-time hiring less frequently than Public Sector employers. However, more meaningful are differences among the various industries and Public Sector employers. While employers as a whole evidence little concrete enthusiasm for expanding their current part-time hiring practice, the public administration group, the Federal, State, County, and Municipal agencies, currently the least frequent employers of part-time workers evidence more interest in developing new part-time hiring practices than most Private Sector industry groups or other Public Sector employers.

9) Employers in the Public Sector do not feel a social commitment to alter conventional hiring practices so that disadvantaged women might have some labor market participation on a part-time basis.

Public Sector employers feel slightly more positive than Private Sector employers about the social desirability of mothers of female-headed households working to support their families, 87% to 80%. Health, education and welfare-type employers feel more positively about this issue than the public administration group. Curiously both Public and Private employers impress as feeling a commitment to implement their beliefs. For the Public Sector employers feel that their sector is the "most suitable employer" of such women while the Private Sector sees itself as the best potential absorber. Interestingly the public administration group sees "government" as the most suitable employer though Private Sector employers and the public service. group eschew the governmental agencies and institutions as potentially best suited. Since the Federal, State, County and Municipal employers also revealed themselves to be the most willing to consider moving in the direction of opening up new non-standard work arrangements for women, there is reason for some optimism that the relative conservatism of "government," some of which emerged in the data analysis in this study, may be wavering.

10) The possibilities for Public Service employment for women part-time workers is limited by the number and location of institutions capable of hiring women workers and by the paucity of units of Municipal, County, State and Federal government able to absorb large numbers of personnel.

The greatest consideration concerning the availability of Public Service employment for women relates to funding and program expansion to provide suitable job opportunities. However, inadequacy of public transportation and the dearth of potential public employers in most localities outside central city areas of the SMSA make employment planning based on availability of Public Sector facilities unrealistic for non-center city dwellers.

11) If minimally-skilled women are to find steady part-time employment new kinds of requirements, inducements, or schemes must be developed to make such employment a reality in both segments of the economy,

There are great extremes among both Public and Private Sector employers in regard to the offering of part-time employment of a steady nature. The public administration sub-group, Federal, State, County, and Municipal agencies offer less steady employment than most other employer groups studied in either sector of the economy. This seems related to the overall low-level use of part-time workers as compared to other groups i.e., employers who are frequent employers of part-time workers tend to offer steady employment more often than lesser employers. In the case of public administration, changes in hiring policies are necessary if their part-time work is to offer continuity of employment. Since the nature of the industry appears to offer the best explanation for the extent to which part-time hiring takes place in the Private Sector, inducements to increase steady part-time employment would have to be considered industry by industry. With subsidies overwhelmingly rejected as an inducement to engage in further part-time hiring, other leverages must be considered to encourage industrial employers to "rationalize" their hiring so that employment may be more stable in duration. Job-sharing by two women assigned to fill one job slot may offer the best possibility for increasing the proportion of part-time employment in certain industries where little stable part-time work is reported.

Some Questions Answered

This investigation hoped to answer some specific questions concerning the current practice of part-time employment.

1) Do employers see value to themselves in having some women work steady non-standard hours or a part-time work week?

Since the most frequent employers of part-time women workers are the same employers who most often report the offering of stable part-time employment (and also tend to be the most optimistic about the possibility of establishing steady employment as the norm) it appears that experienced employers consider at least a portion of their part-time work forces as part of their normal work complement, placing a positive value on their presence.

2) What types of short shift or abbreviated work-weeks are of interest to area employers?

SMSA employers use a wide variety of short shifts by day and night, the most popular of which is "fewer hours during the work day," "Afternoon only" shifts are more popular than "morning only" shifts in the Private Sector. Private employers use night shifts at almost double the rate of Public. The most used short night shift is one immediately following the regular work day. More Public Sector employers are using the concept of job-sharing by two women than Private. About one-fifth of the Public Sector employers engage in such practice while only about a tenth of Private employers hire on such a basis.

3) What types of jobs are seen as best suited to part-time work?

Because of lack of interviewing time, this study did not cover the occupational-industrial distribution of less-than-full time women employees. Some hints may be found in the data collected, but further study is required to ascertain the specific job classifications in which part-time workers are most prominently included.

The prominence of Trade and Finance-and-insurance in part-time hiring suggests the heavy use of part-time sales and clerical personnel, confirming long-standing data on the subject. Even here, further inquiry is required since Trade is the field most likely to have all job categories open to part-timers. The specific usage of part-timers in the Services, in the Health field, in Colleges and Schools, all heavy users, requires further investigation.

4) What might benefits of hiring some part-time workers be to employers? The difficulties?

Employers indicated primary interest in use of part-timers to cover peak loads. Of second rank interest was the desire to maximize use of capital investment while avoiding overtime and extending hours of customer service. Almost no interest was expressed as to the potential for inhibiting the effectiveness of unions.

No major problems were indicated concerning personnel administration. Obstacles posed by unions differ industry by industry. Some are cooperative while others introduce conditions designed to discourage the practice. While many government employers believe Civil Service regulations prohibit non-standard working hours, this is usually the result of misinformation combined with reluctance.

5) What special provisions would be needed if employers decide to take on some part-time women workers? What changes? Legislation?

Few impediments to the hiring of women part-time workers were found which could not be satisfactorily dealt with if the will exists. When a tight labor market existed in certain areas of the SMSA in recent years, many standard practices were deviated from by SMSA employers.

Some changes in legislation are required to make part-time employment equitable to workers. However, no legal disabilities for employers were uncovered.

Employers overwhelmingly believe that job training is necessary for their entry-level workers. Only 11% indicate no training is required. Almost 60% of the private employers and about 40% of the public indicate this training is given by the employer. About one-fifth of the Private Sector employers and 30% of the Public state they also use "Other" sources than programs either given by or funded by government. Little reliance is placed on programs emanating from government.

Employers overwhelmingly agree that day care is necessary for women workers to meet the expectations of a job, but are divided as to whom should provide it. There is little sentiment for employer provision. There is also no firm conviction expressed that government should be the major provider.

6) Are employers interested in hiring some of these women for their own companies?

As noted earlier, employers already are hiring women part-time workers on a widespread basis.

7) Does the employer see social value in having women heads-of-households participate in the labor force, if only on a part-time basis?

Employers overwhelmingly are in favor of mothers who are household heads working. Each group, the Private Sector employers, and the two sub-groups within the Public Sector, see themselves as the most desirable employers of such women.

8) How do the views of Public Sector employers compare with those of the Private Sector?

Generalizations are difficult. While the Public Sector reports part-time hiring more frequently than the Private, the Public Sector is more conservative about what it offers than the Private. Public Sector employers, even more frequently than Private, believe it is socially desirable for mothers to work. At the same time they also are in favor of more social provision by government than the Private Sector.

Implications of the Study Concerning the Data

In conclusion this inquiry has added to knowledge of the circumstances of part-time employment, particularly concerning short shifts in usage and the patterns of such usage. Data have also been collected concerning stability of employment by industry, size of payroll, and location. Union Obstacles, one set of considerations in the decision to use non-standard work arrangements, were explored. Some documentation concerning the change in social attitudes concerning employment of mothers was provided, with some material concerning the lag in readiness to provide the necessary social supports which make such employment viable. Data was also provided concerning the availability of public transportation by day and night.

Some data concerning the current obstacles to implementation of paraprofessional programs in Public Sector agencies and institutions was offered. Material concerning the possible obstacles which Civil Service systems may offer to the hiring of aspiring women workers at the entry-level was given. Legislative changes needed to make part-time employment more equitable to workers were specified.

Implications for Further Research

Many areas concerning part-time employment remain to be investigated. First, there is a need to investigate the extent of part-time employment quantitatively within plants, industry by industry. Second, information is needed concerning the importance which benefits play in the decision to hire part-time workers. Third, information is needed concerning how unionized employers would be affected by the presence of more women heads-of-households since benefits differ from those offered other workers. Fourth, the usage of part-time workers for relief, work breaks, absenteeism, coverage of peak loads, or for jobs specific to the part-time worker requires examination. Fifth, more needs to be known about women who work short shifts at night. Does this work represent a second paid job or a few hours paid employment following a day of unpaid "homemaking" which is now coming to be respected as useful employment? Sixth, the extent of involuntary part-time employment needs to be established and located.

Implications for Theory Development

Beginning attempts have been made to explain why some industries engage in part-time hiring and others do not. This study shows that most of the industrial groups identified by the Standard Industrial Classification system currently engage in some part-time hiring. Until the extent and more of the circumstances of such hiring are known, it will not be possible to engage in sophisticated formulations explaining employer behavior. Attempts to theorize about part-time employment as being small, marginal, low status industries or institutions (i.e., the lower part of the bifurcated labor market) may be unsound if part-time employment is as extensively used as indicated in this survey.[1]

Early attempts to theorize about part-time employment (as well as about part-time workers) appear to be influenced by a perception of such employment and its participant workers as stigmatized. If current part-time employment can be shown to be more widely spread through industry and public-type employment than previously believed, then the direction of theory building might change. Conceptualizations would be more likely to move in directions other than stigma.

Conclusions:
Implications for Social Policy

Major Conclusions

1) Widespread usage of part-time workers indicates that future employment planning must include non-standard work arrangements as an integral part of the overall employment picture. Even fields long considered resistent to

---

[1] Dean Morse Cites attempts to establish theories concerning the identity of part-time employers. Robert Averitt is noted as one economist engaged in speculation about the identification of non-standard employers in The Dual Economy (New York: W.W. Norton, 1968), pp.1-2.

part-time hiring such as the manufacturing field and the chemical and allied industries frequently use non-standard arrangements. Public administration is the area most resistent to use of part-time workers, Civil Service requirements often mistakenly being given as the reason for precluding such arrangements. Attitudinal change is needed to cope with the belief in government that there is "no need" for deviation from standard practice. Further study of the benefits question is required to better understand employer motivations in hiring part-time workers.

2) The widespread usage of part-time workers may provide an opportunity for many women heads-of-households to obtain employment status and the benefits associated with it. The pattern of part-time employment, as developed in this inquiry, indicates many arrangements in usage by day, night, and week widely distributed throughout industry and health, education, and welfare establishments. Women who wish to work part-time currently have many opportunities to work out some plan for themselves provided they are satisfied with entry-level employment. This is qualified by the relative inavailability of public transportation outside center city areas and absence of day care facilities. At the same time, the more frequent use of part-time workers in suburban counties suggests that this form of employment may be especially applicable to non-urban areas. The extreme limitations of public transportation outside the central cities suggests that planners for non-urban areas must look to both sectors of the economy as potential employers of disadvantaged workers and can not depend upon the limited number of often inaccessible Public Sector employers in these areas.

3) The considerable employer optimism that a norm of stable employment is feasible is a factor in favor of consideration of part-time employment as an arrangement suitable for many work-oriented women who head families.

4) Since employers report high levels of interest in using part-time workers, for purposes of better meeting peak loads, utilizing capital investment while avoiding overtime and expanding hours of customer service, program developers could cite these benefits accruing from the use of part-time women workers. Work-income programs can hardly be sold on the basis of avoidance of benefit payments or unionization. In the case of the latter the facts do not necessarily support the notion that part-time workers can not be organized.

5) In view of the strong indication that part-time employment does not create personnel problems nor involve marked additional expense in administration, program developers could therefore assure prospective employers on these issues.

6) Generalizations can not be made as to a union position on non-standard employment arrangements. These must be studied industry by industry. Union attitudes in the public service area will be increasingly important in view of current efforts at unionization in this area.

7) The needs of women workers who require steady income who can only locate intermittent-type employment need to be dealt with.

Minor Conclusions

1) Should government push present work policies (WIN Program) for mothers who are heads-of-households

aggressively or attempt to implement new income-work programs, administrators will find public opinion, at least the employer portion of it, solidly behind the concept. However, proposals for Public Serivce-type employment in "government" would not receive widespread support.

2) There has been a marked change in public attitudes concerning the responsibilities which society is willing to place upon mothers of children. However, there is a lag between the expectations and societal willingness to provide the social facilitators.

3) Since the concept of "subsidy" as an inducement to hire minimally-skilled women is overwhelmingly rejected by Private Sector employers, alternative means need to be developed to open employment office doors to disadvantaged women workers.

4) Women workers will have to become involved in the political process if they expect to claim a fair share of big city municipal employment. This employment is increasingly desirable as unionization makes it more lucrative than comparable private employment.

5) Policy makers need to learn more about the circumstances of part-time night employment. For purposes of policy planning it would be desirable to know how many women feel compelled to accept a paid job at night after working a regular day time shift. It would also be helpful to learn how many women employed part-time at night regard themselves as having completed a full day of homemaking prior to the night hours.

Recommendations

1) Part-time women workers at or near the entry-level are such an integral part of the current American

labor force that income-work schemes built around the part-time concept are feasible. Because of past problems in persuading employers to voluntarily make enough jobs for disadvantaged workers available to make an impact on the problem, it is recommended that employers of 50-or-more workers be required to set aside a small portion of their employment slots for disadvantaged workers, among whom female heads-of-households would be included. "Reserved" slots for such women might be utilized on a "job-sharing" basis, with two women splitting one job. In view of the poor performance of public administration in opening government employment to women part-time workers, special effort would be needed to assure that government on all levels assumes its share of employment provision for the disadvantaged.

The participation of both sectors of the economy is necessary if women in non-urban areas are to be included in work-income schemes. With increasing recognition of expanding pockets of poverty in suburban areas, any new programs involving employment for disadvantaged women workers should take into consideration transportation problems, an especially acute problem for mothers who may not feel free to attempt long-distance commuting, even if this were possible. Also, remuneration from part-time employment would not justify large expenditures of time and money for extensive commuting. In some areas, little work is available for anyone, in which case cottage employment, self-employment, or the establishment of small cooperatives might have to be considered if a public policy of achieving at least partial employment of all employables is to be achieved.

Because much part-time employment is still intermittent in nature, special help needs to be given to those women who desire regular part-time work but who can not locate such employment. State employment services should consider developing temporary help "job banks" for such women. While the case may be argued that much of the employment currently being offered through state employment service facilities is of the menial, irregular entry-level type, this does not address itself to the peculiar needs of women who essentially need "temporary help" agency services for purposes of maintaining continuity of income.

2) The Women's Bureau should be requested to develop new legislative proposals to correct present inequities in Unemployment Compensation eligibility and pension fund inclusion on behalf of part-time workers.

3) Attention should be given to development of a new source of small business listings, both for purposes of study of labor market conditions and business as well as for use by job developers and placement personnel. As a beginning, some scheme might be worked out whereby an appropriate government agency would persuade such organizations as currently have available some such information (telephone companies, tax offices) to key punch their listings by industrial classification so that this information could be retrieved. The problem of confidentiality would also have to be resolved.

4) While part-time employment can provide a socially desirable means by which mothers have some labor market participation while maintaining family obligations, such arrangements are economically viable only if supplemented by other income. It would be advantageous to develop non-stigmatized, work-related grants tied to status as mothers (e.g., mother's wages) or work (e.g., such as Unemployment Compensation).

APPENDIX A

TABLE 1

RANKING OF GREATER PHILADELPHIA SMSA INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYERS REPORTING RECENT EXPERIENCE IN HIRING WOMEN PART-TIME WORKERS, BY INDUSTRY

Type of Industry	Number of Employers	Percentage of Respondent Employers
Trade............................	97	87%
Finance-and-insurance...........	61	82
Services.........................	53	76
Manufacturers....................	63	68
Food-processors..................	28	68
Apparel..........................	47	55
Paper-and-printing...............	20	55
Textiles.........................	28	43
Chemical-and-allied industries..	35	37

TABLE 2

RANKING OF GREATER PHILADELPHIA SMSA PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYERS REPORTING RECENT EXPERIENCE IN HIRING WOMEN PART-TIME WORKERS, BY TYPE OF PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYER

Type of Public Sector Employer	Number of Employers	Percentage of Respondent Employers
Colleges-and-universities........	39	92%
Health agencies-and-institutions.	224	88
Schools..........................	31	84
Social agencies..................	210	79
Other............................	14	78
County...........................	53	53
Federal..........................	45	40
Municipal........................	18	39
State............................	38	29

TABLE 3

RATES OF REPORTED GREATER PHILADELPHIA SMSA EMPLOYER HIRING OF PART-TIME WOMEN WORKERS, BY SIZE OF PAYROLL, PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTORS

Size of Payroll	Private Sector		Public Sector	
	N=	Percentage of Respondent Employers	N=	Percentage of Respondent Employers
1-24	125	63%	196	64%
25-49	58	69	116	71
50-299	126	69	218	80
300-499	37	70	38	95
500-999	43	72	51	78
1,000-and-more	49	71	53	77

Percentages are based on number of respondent employers in each size category.

TABLE 4

RANKING OF REPORTED GREATER PHILADELPHIA SMSA EMPLOYER HIRING OF PART-TIME WOMEN WORKERS, BY COUNTY

County	Number of Respondent Employers	Percentage of Respondent Employers
Pennsylvania Portion of SMSA		
Montgomery	190	81%
Bucks	79	78
Chester	102	73
Delaware	112	73
Philadelphia	424	71
New Jersey Portion of SMSA		
Gloucester	56	71
Burlington	58	64
Camden	86	59

Percentages are based on number of respondent employers in each county.

TABLE 5

RATE OF URBANIZATION OF GREATER PHILADELPHIA SMSA COUNTIES, BY RANK

County	Rate of Urbanization
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania...........	100%
Delaware, Pennsylvania...............	97
Camden, New Jersey...................	96
Montgomery, Pennsylvania.............	82
Burlington, New Jersey...............	81
Bucks, Pennsylvania..................	76
Gloucester, New Jersey...............	71
Chester, Pennsylvania................	45

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of the Population: 1970. Vol. 1 Characteristics of the Population, Part 40, Pennsylvania--Section 1.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE ON PART-TIME WORK FOR WOMEN

PLEASE CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE ITEM FOR EACH ANSWER. EXTENDED ANSWERS ARE WELCOMED. ATTACH A SHEET FOR YOUR COMMENTS, INCLUDING NUMBER OF QUESTION.

1. Name of business: ______________________________
County: ( ) ______________________________
Number of employees at this time: ( ) ______________________________

PLEASE CORRECT OR ADD TO THE ABOVE INFORMATION IF NECESSARY.

The following jobs, at beginning levels, are examples of those held by women with minimal vocational skills:

accounting clerk
assembler
assistant cook
bookkeeper
cashier
clerk-typist
computer operator
food service worker
hotel housekeeper
inspector
keypuncher
office machine operator
parts changer
presser
sales clerk
sewing machine operator
stenographer (beginner)
stock clerk
telephone operator
testor
waitress

2. Do you presently have women workers holding such types of jobs in your company? (1) YES (2) NO

If YES, could such types of jobs be made available to some women on a part-time basis in your company? (1) YES (2) NO

3. Do you have any recent experience in hiring women part-time? (1) YES (2) NO

4. Women could be used on abbreviated work schedules as follows: CIRCLE WHAT YOU DO; UNDERLINE WHAT YOU COULD DO. (INDICATE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Part day
(b) For all jobs
(c) For steady work
(d) Part week
(e) For some jobs
(f) At certain times
(g) NO

5. The following are some shorter-than-normal shifts. CIRCLE THE SHIFTS YOU ALREADY USE; UNDERLINE THOSE YOU COULD USE. (INDICATE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Regular morning period only
(b) Regular afternoon period only
(c) Short shift before regular shift
(d) Short shift after regular shift
(e) Fewer hours during the work day
(f) Shorter shifts at night
(g) Two women sharing one job
(h) Other
(i) None

6. Do you hire some women for a short work-week (fewer days than full time)? (1) YES (2) NO

Could you hire some women for a short work-week? (1) YES (2) NO

7. If part-time employment for some women workers is of any interest to your company, what kinds of regularity of employment can (could) the workers expect?

(a) Steady (b) Seasonal (c) Depends on job (d) Unpredictable (e) No interest

8. Do you believe the presence of some steady part-time women workers makes (could make) for better productivity or service in your company?

(a) In terms of better meeting daily and weekly peak loads

(b) Achieving greater efficiency per hours worked

(c) Better use of capital investment without overtime

(d) Less absenteeism (e) Less turnover (f) No

9. Does (would) an abbreviated work day or work week benefit your company in any of the following areas? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Ease labor shortages

(b) Meet the needs of the customer better by expanding hours of service

(c) Help reduce full-time workers' bargaining power for wage increases

10. Approximately how much does the size of your work force vary during the year?

(1) 0% (2) 10% (3) 25% (4) 50% (5) More than 50%

11. When is your work force largest in numbers? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Spring (b) Summer (c) Fall (d) Winter (e) No variation

12. When is your work force smallest in numbers? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Spring (b) Summer (c) Fall (d) Winter (e) No variation

13. What types of labor market do you think favorable for part-time employment?

(a) Normal (b) Tight (c) Surplus (d) Seasonal (e) Other

14. If your company hires (might hire) some women on a part-time basis, what type of union difficulties (might) develop? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Fears of loss of overtime

(b) Fears of loss of leverage in wage demands

(c) Fears of inability to organize

(d) No difficulties (e) No union

15. Would you anticipate (do you have) personnel difficulties if you were to hire some part-time women workers? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Desire of full-time women to switch to part-time

(b) Increased supervisory costs

(c) Friction between full-time and part-time employees

(d) No difficulties

16. If special skills are needed for your entry-level employment, i.e., such beginning jobs as clerk-typist, general sales clerk, or assembler, where does the worker obtain such training? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) No training required (b) Employer (c) Government Training Programs

(d) Government-sponsored or funded training programs (e) Other

17. Is public transportation to your company available? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

By day? (a) Adequate (b) Limited (c) None

By night? (a) Adequate (b) Limited (c) None (d) Not applicable - No night shift
(By "night" is meant the time following the normal work day and up to the next normal work day.)

18. Do you believe that day care facilities for children are necessary so that women who are heads-of-households can meet the expectations of a job? (1) YES (2) NO

If YES, who should provide them? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Self-provided (b) Government (c) Private Social Agencies (d) Employer

19. Would any changes in existing laws be necessary for your company to employ women on an abbreviated work day or work week? (1) YES (2) NO

COMMENT: ____

____

____

20. Would a government subsidy be necessary to enable your company to employ women heads-of-households on a steady part-time basis? (1) YES (2) NO

If YES, would YOUR company be interested in such a subsidy? (1) YES (2) NO

COMMENT: ____

____

21. Is it feasible to establish a pattern of steady part-time work in your industry for women qualified for entry-level type jobs? ("Steady" work means throughout the year as opposed to seasonal or intermittent employment.) (1) YES (2) NO

22. Do you believe it is socially desirable for companies to make an effort to hire on a part-time basis some minimally-skilled women who are heads-of-households? (1) YES (2) NO

23. Who do you think makes the most suitable employer of women heads-of-households with minimal skills? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Private employers

(b) Government

(c) Government-sponsored Institutions, Schools, Hospitals, Poverty Programs, etc.

(d) Other

***

Thank you for your interest and consideration of these questions. Please add additional sheets for any comments you may wish to make.

If you would be willing to further discuss your thinking with the investigator, please indicate your name and phone number. ALL RESPONSES IN CONFIDENCE.

NAME: ______________________________ PHONE NUMBER ______________________
(Area Code)

I would prefer a: telephone interview ____
face-to-face interview ____

QUESTIONNAIRE ON PART-TIME WORK FOR WOMEN

PLEASE CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE ITEM FOR EACH ANSWER. EXTENDED ANSWERS ARE WELCOMED. ATTACH A SHEET FOR YOUR COMMENTS, INCLUDING NUMBER OF QUESTION.

1. Name of Organization ______________________________
County (or counties) in which your organization is located? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

PENNSYLVANIA

(a) Philadelphia
(b) Montgomery
(c) Delaware
(d) Bucks
(e) Chester

NEW JERSEY

(f) Burlington
(g) Camden
(h) Gloucester

Number of employees at this time? (on your staff or under your jurisdiction)

(1) 1-24 (2) 25-49 (3) 50-299 (4) 300-499 (5) 500-999 (6) 1,000 and over

The following jobs, at beginning levels, are examples of those held by women with minimal vocational skills:

accounting clerk
assistant cook
bookkeeper
case-aides
case-finder
cashier
computer operator
court matron
food service worker
homemaker
home-school coordinator
neighborhood community organizer
nurse's aide
office machine operator
psychiatric aide
reach-out aide
receptionist
special skill instructor
teacher's aide
telephone operator
vocational rehab. aide

2. Do you presently have women workers holding such types of jobs in your agency or institution? (1) YES (2) NO

If YES, could such types of jobs be made available to some women on a part-time basis in your agency or institution? (1) YES (2) NO

3. Do you have any recent experience in hiring women part-time? (1) YES (2) NO

4. Women could be used on abbreviated work schedules as follows: CIRCLE WHAT YOU DO; UNDERLINE WHAT YOU COULD DO. (INDICATE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Part day
(b) For all jobs
(c) For steady work
(d) Part week
(e) For some jobs
(f) At certain times

5. The following are some shorter-than-normal shifts. CIRCLE THE SHIFTS YOU ALREADY USE; UNDERLINE THOSE WHICH YOU COULD USE. (INDICATE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Regular morning period only
(b) Regular afternoon period only
(c) Short shift before regular shift
(d) Short shift after regular shift
(e) Fewer hours during the work day
(f) Shorter shifts at night
(g) Two women sharing one job
(h) Other
(i) None

6. Do you hire some women a short work-week (fewer days than full-time)? (1) YES (2) NO

Could you hire some women for a short work-week? (1) YES (2) NO

7. If part-time employment for some women workers is of any interest to your agency or institution, what kinds of regularity of employment can (could) the workers expect? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Steady (b) Seasonal (c) Depends on job (d) Unpredictable (e) No interest

8. Do you believe that the presence of some steady part-time women workers makes (could make) for better productivity or service in your agency or institution? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) In terms of better meeting daily and weekly peak loads

(b) Achieving greater efficiency per hours worked

(c) Better use of capital investment without overtime

(d) Less absenteeism (e) Less turnover (f) No

9. Does (would) an abbreviated work-day or work-week benefit your agency or institution in any of the following areas? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Ease labor shortages

(b) Meet the needs of the customer better by expanding service hours

(c) Help reduce full-time workers' bargaining power for wage increases

10. Approximately how much does the size of your work force vary during the year?

(1) 0% (2) 10% (3) 25% (4) 50% (5) More than 50%

11. When is your work force largest in numbers? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Spring (b) Summer (c) Fall (d) Winter (e) No variation

12. When is your work force smallest in numbers? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Spring (b) Summer (c) Fall (d) Winter (e) No variation

13. What type of labor market do you think favorable for part-time employment? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Normal (b) Tight (c) Surplus (d) Seasonal (e) Other

14. If your agency or institution hires (might hire) some women on a part-time basis what type of union difficulties (might) develop? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Fears of loss of overtime (b) Fears of loss of leverage in wage demands

(c) Fears of inability to organize (d) No difficulties (e) No union

15. Would you anticipate (do you have) personnel difficulties if you were to hire some part-time women workers? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Desire of full-time women to switch to part-time

(b) Increased supervisory costs

(c) Friction between full-time and part-time employees

(d) No difficulties

16. If special skills are needed for your entry-level employment, i.e., such beginning jobs as clerk-typist, nurse's aide, or home-school coordinator, where does the worker obtain such training? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) No training required (b) Employer (c) Government training programs

(d) Government sponsored or funded training programs (e) Other

17. Is public transportation to your agency or institution available? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

By day? (a) Adequate (b) Limited (c) None

By night? (a) Adequate (b) Limited (c) None (d) Not applicable -- No night shift
(By "night" is meant the time following the normal work day and up to the next normal work day.)

18. Do you believe that day care facilities for children are necessary so that women who are heads-of-households can meet the expectations of a job? (1) YES (2) NO

If YES, who should provide them? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Self-provided (b) Government (c) Private social agencies (d) Employer

19. Would any changes in existing labor laws be necessary for your agency or institution to employ women on an abbreviated work-day or work-week?

20. Would a government subsidy be necessary to enable your agency or institution to employ women heads-of-households on a steady part-time basis? (1) YES (2) NO

21. Is it feasible to establish a pattern of steady part-time work in your type of agency or institution for women qualified for entry-level type jobs? ("Steady" work means throughout the year as opposed to seasonal or intermittent employment.) (1) YES (2) NO

22. Do you believe it is socially desirable for employers to make an effort to hire on a part-time basis some minimally-skilled women who are heads-of-households? (1) YES (2) NO

23. Who do you think makes the most suitable employer of women heads-of-households with minimal skills? (CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY.)

(a) Private employers (b) Government (c) Government sponsored institutions, schools, hospitals, poverty programs, etc. (d) Other

24. What factors other than labor market considerations affect your ability to hire minimally-skilled women on a part-time basis? (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Employment guidelines by government funding agencies requiring hiring of disadvantaged or client populations

(b) Availability of federal funds for public service-type jobs

(c) Redesign of professional jobs to provide opportunities for para-professionals

(d) Program expansion (e) Present oversupply of para-professionals

(f) Other (g) None

25. If your agency or institution is covered by Civil Service, would (do) part-time women workers have difficulty complying with Civil Service regulations? (1) YES (2) NO

If YES (CIRCLE AS MANY ITEMS AS APPLY.)

(a) Lack of provision for a non-standard work-day or work-week

(b) Inability to pass tests competitively

(c) Lack of availability of suitable positions

(d) Problem of suitable job descriptions for para-professional positions

(e) Other

Thank you for your interest and consideration of these questions. Please add additional sheets for any comments you may wish to make.

If you would be willing to further discuss your thinking with the investigator, please indicate your name and telephone number. ALL RESPONSES IN CONFIDENCE.

NAME ______________________________ Telephone number: ____________________

___ I would prefer a telephone interview.

___ I would prefer a face-to-face interview.

815 New Gulph Road
Bryn Mawr, Penna. 19010
November 1, 1972

Mr. Wendell M. Clark, Secretary
Fullauria Inc.
6th & Market Sts.
Camden, New Jersey 08104

Dear Mr. Clark:

I am conducting a survey concerning the employment of women. With the increasing social commitment to aid women has come rising social approval of mothers working to support their families.

Part-time employment is one means by which women with family responsibilities manage a job. Though part-time work is widespread, little is known about its circumstances or possibilities as a source of steady family income.

This survey is intended to secure information and opinion from Greater Philadelphia area employers concerning the hiring of minimally-skilled women on a part-time basis. Mr. Thacher Longstreth, President of the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce has endorsed the objectives of this study and has expressed the hope that busy businessmen will take the time to complete the questionnaire.

Would you aid this study by having the questionnaire filled out by the person in your organization most qualified to do so? Could it be returned by November 15, 1972?

All expressions of opinion will be held in confidence and will not be identified in the report of this study, a summary of which will be sent to you upon request.

Sincerely,

Ruth W. Prywes

Ruth W. Prywes
Bryn Mawr College Graduate School
of Social Work and Social Research

Encls: Questionnaire
Return Envelope

815 New Gulph Road
Bryn Mawr, Pa. 19010
November 6, 1972

Mrs. Louisa Hoffman, R.N., Administrator
Robinson Memorial Foundation
534 N. Broadway
Pitman, New Jersey 08071

Dear Mrs. Hoffman:

I am conducting a survey concerning the employment of women. This survey is intended to secure information and opinion from Greater Philadelphia area employers concerning the hiring of minimally-skilled women on a part-time basis.

Part-time employment is one means by which women with family responsibilities manage a job. Though part-time work is widespread, little is known about its circumstances or possibilities as a source of steady income.

Since the public sector of the economy is often seen as the most logical employer of peripheral work groups such as women heads-of-households, your expression of opinion and practice regarding part-time work for women can contribute to greater understanding of the present and potential role of the "public" employer in regard to women.

Would you aid in this study by having the questionnaire filled out by the person in your organization most qualified to do so? Could it be returned by November 21, 1972?

All expressions of opinion will be held in confidence and will not be identified in the report of this study, a summary of which will be sent to you upon request.

Sincerely,

Ruth Prywes

Ruth Prywes
Bryn Mawr College Graduate School
of Social Work and Social Research

Encs: Questionnaire
Return Envelope

REMINDER

815 New Gulph Road
Bryn Mawr, Pa. 19010
November 13, 1972

Dear Sir:

Last week I mailed you a questionnaire soliciting your experience and opinions concerning part-time work for women.

If you have not already done so, would you kindly take the time to reply? Your completion of the questionnaire will add to the very limited knowledge about part-time work.

Meaningful conclusions can be drawn from the data collected only if a large number of employers respond.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Ruth Prywes
Bryn Mawr College

---

815 New Gulph Road
Bryn Mawr, Pa. 19010
December 12, 1973

Dear Sir:

This is to thank you for being one of the many Greater Philadelphia employers who recently returned my questionnaire concerning the part-time employment for women.

By participating in this study you have contributed to the very limited knowledge of this subject.

Thank you,

Ruth Prywes
Bryn Mawr College

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, Edith. Women in Industry. New York and London: D. Appleton and Co., 1910.

American Women. Report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

Analytic Systems, Inc. Analysis of WIN Program Termination Data (Fiscal Year 1970). Chicago: May, 1971.

Bancroft, Gertrude. "Trends in the Part-Time Labor Force," The American Labor Force, Its Growth and Composition. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Barker, Robert L. and Briggs, Thomas L. Differential Use of Social Work Manpower. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1968.

Barrett, Jeanne. "Tipping the Economic See-saw: A New View of the Old Dilemma." Career Development, Vol. 1, No. 2 (May, 1971), pp. 10-13.

Bauer, John. Employment and Transportation in Delaware County. Delaware County Board of Assistance, mimeo, no date.

Becker, Gary. "A Theory on the Allocation of Time." Economic Journal. Vol. LXXV, No. 299 (September, 1965), pp. 493-517.

Bernard, Jessie. "Labor Force Participation, Employment Status and Dependency Among Mothers" in Klausner, Samuel, The Work Incentive (WIN) Program: Making Adults Economically Independent, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1973.

_________ Women and the Public Interest. Chicago: Aldine, 1971.

Bernard, Sidney E. "The Nixon Family Assistance Plan, How It Will Fail and Why I Support It." Poverty and Human Resources, Vol. 5, No. 5 (September-October, 1970), pp. 5-13.

Bluestone, Barry. "Low Wage Industries and the Working Poor." in Poverty and Human Resources, Vol. III, No. 2 (April, 1968), pp. 1-14.

__________ "The Tripartite Economy Labor Markets and the Working Poor." Poverty and Human Resources, Vol. 5, No. 4 (July-August, 1970), pp. 15-35.

__________ "The Welfare Crisis: No Exit." Urban and Social Change Review, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Spring, 1972), pp. 63-66.

Bowen, William G. and Finegan, T. Aldrich. Economics of Labor Force Participation. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Bruntz, Francois. "The Part-Time Employment of Women in Industrialized Countries." International Labor Review, Vol. No. 5 (November, 1962), pp. 425-442.

Carter, Genevieve W. "The Employment Potential of AFDC Mothers." Welfare in Review, 6 (4), (July-August, 1968).

Conference on Upgrading and New Careers. Washington, D.C.: National Manpower Policy Task Force. March 20, 1970.

Case Against Night Work for Women. Court of Appeals of State of New York, Louis D. Brandeis and Josephine Goldmark. New York: National Consumers League of New York, April, 1914.

Case of the Shorter Work Day. Supreme Court of the United States, Felix Frankfurter and Josephine Goldmark, New York: National Consumers League, 1915.

Cox, Irene. "The Employment of Mothers as a Means of Family Support." Welfare in Review, Vol. 8, No. 6 (November-December, 1970), pp. 9-17.

Couturier, Jean. "Accommodating Merit Systems to Upgrading," in *Conference on Upgrading and New Careers*, sponsored by the National Manpower Policy Task Force, Washington, D.C., 1970, pp. 84-91.

__________ "Public Employment and the Disadvantaged-Promises or Program?" *Personnel Report 701; Social Trends: Their Impact on the Public Service*, pp. 19-28.

Dankert, Clyde; Mann, Floyd; and Northrup, Herbert R. *Hours of Work*. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Decker, Floyd A.; Horgan, Andrew B. III; and Williams, Lawrence A. *Municipal Government Efforts to Provide Career Employment Opportunities for the Disadvantaged*. National League of Cities, Department of Urban Studies, December, 1969.

Delaware Valley Data. No. 6. Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, (January, 1973).

Dewey, Lucretia M. "Women in Labor Unions." *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 94, No. 2 (February, 1971), pp. 42-48.

Doeringer, Peter; Feldman, Penny; Gordon, David; Piore, Michael; and Reich, Michael. *Low-Income Labor Markets and Urban Manpower Programs--A Critical Assessment*, Research and Development Findings No. 12, United States Department of Labor/Manpower Administration. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1972.

Durbin, Elizabeth. *The Effect of Welfare Programs on the Decision to Work*. New York: Project Labor Market, Graduate School of Business Administration, New York University, August, 1968.

Federal Personnel Manual. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Feldman, Harold and Feldman, Penny. *A Study of the Effects on the Family Due to the Employment of the Welfare Mother: Vol. I, Findings and Implications*. New York: Cornell University, Ithaca: College of Human Ecology, January, 1972.

Ferman, Louis. Job Development for the Hard to Employ. Policy Paper No. 11. Ann Arbor: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, 1969.

Fine, Sidney A. Guidelines for Employment of the Culturally Disadvantaged. Kalamazoo: Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1969.

__________ Remarks in Conference on Upgrading and New Careers, Sponsored by the National Manpower Policy Task Force, Washington, D.C.; 1970, p. 54.

Friedman, Milton. Capitalism and Freedom. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Gil, David. Unraveling Social Policy. Cambridge: Shenkman, 1973.

Ginzberg, Eli; Hiestand, Dale; and Reubens, Beatrice. The Pluralistic Economy. New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1968.

Glicksman, Albert and Brown, Zenia. Changing Schedules of Work: Patterns and Implications. Final Report. Washington, D.C.: American Institute for Research, February, 1973.

Gold, Stephen F. "The Failure of the Work Incentive (WIN) Program." University of Pennsylvania Law Review, Vol. 119, No. 1 (January, 1971), pp. 112-128.

Goodwin, Leonard. "On Making Social Research Relevant to Public Policy and National Problem Solving." American Psychologist, Vol. 26, No. 5 (May, 1971), pp. 431-442.

Graham, Benjamin. On the Flexible Work Year; An Answer to Employment. Occasional Paper on the Role of the Economic Order in the Free Society. Stanford Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Fund for the Republic, 1964.

Greenleigh Associates. A Public Employment Program for the Unemployed Poor. New York: November, 1965.

Grosser, Charles; Henry, William E.; and Kelley, James G.; Nonprofessionals in the Human Services. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Gubbel, R. The Economic Citizenship of Women. Brussels: Universite Libre de Brussels, 1966.

Haskell, Mark. The New Careers Concept: Potential for Public Employment of the Poor. New York, New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.

Hallaire, Jean. Part-time Employment: Its Extent and Its Problem. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1968.

Hausman, Leonard J. "The Welfare Tax Rate: Its Relationship to the Employability and Self-supportability of AFDC Recipients." Transaction: Social Science and Modern Society, Vol. 6, No. 6 (April, 1967), pp. 48-53.

__________ Potential for Work Among Welfare Parents. Manpower Research Monograph No. 12. Department of Labor/Manpower Administration. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

__________ The Welfare System as a Manpower and Rehabilitative System. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Hedges, Janice. "Women Workers and Manpower Demands in the 1970's." Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 93, No. 6 (June, 1970), pp. 19-28.

Hewes, Amy. "Women Part-time Workers in the United States." International Labor Review, Vol. LXXXV, No. 5 (November, 1962), pp. 445-452.

Hiland, John E. Jr. Employment of the Poor as Preprofessionals. Supplement #5, Public Welfare--Challenge to Validity, Technical Assistance Project. American Public Welfare Association. Chicago: July, 1969.

Huth, Carol M. (ed.). Return Engagement, a Woman's Guide to Part-time Work and Study in Philadelphia. Alumni Association of Barnard, Bryn Mawr, Mount Holyoke, Radcliffe, Smith, Vassar, Wellesly, and University of Pennsylvania, no publisher cited, 1970.

"International Survey of Part-time Employment." Part I and Part II. International Labor Review. Vol. LXXXVIII, Nos. 4 and 5 (October and November, 1963), pp. 381-407, 490-517.

Kerr, Clark, "Balkanization of Labor Markets," in Bakke, E. Wight, ed. *Labor Mobility and Economic Opportunity* (New York: Technology Press at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley and Sons, 1954), pp. 92-111.

Klausner, Samuel. *The Work Incentive (WIN) Program: Making Adults Economically Independent*. Vol. 1, Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania, 1973.

Klein, Deborah P. "Exploring the Adequacy of Employment," *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 96, No. 10 (October, 1973), pp. 3-9.

Klein, Viola, *Women Workers, Working Hours and Services*, Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1965.

Kreps, Juanita. *Sex in the Market Place: American Women at Work*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins Press, 1971.

Lands Organisationen for Family Questions. *The Trade Unions and the Family*. Stockholm: Bokforlaget Prisma Stockholm in conjunction with the Swedish Trade Union Confederation (LO), 1970.

Levinson, Perry. "How Employable are AFDC Women?" *Welfare in Review*, 1970, *8* (July-August, No. 4), pp. 12-16.

Levitan, Sar. "Manpower Programs Under Republican Management." *Poverty and Human Resources*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (March-April, 1970), pp. 5-11.

Lowenthal, Martin. "Work for Welfare Clients, a Nonreform." *Urban and Social Change Review*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Spring, 1972), pp. 58-63.

Lynton, Edith. *New Careers Potentials in Health: In the Hospital, Beyond the Hospital*. New York: New Careers Development Center, New York University, 1968.

Mangum, Garth. "The Emergence of a National Manpower Policy" in Gordon, Robert, (ed) *Toward a Manpower Policy* (New York: John Wiley, 1967), pp. 11-34.

__________ and Glenn, Lowell. Employing the Disadvantaged in the Federal Civil Service, Policy Papers in Human Resources and Industrial Relations. Ann Arbor: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations and National Manpower Policy Task Force, February, 1969.

Manjic, Marion. "Part-time Work in the Public Service." International Labor Review, Vol. 105, No. 2 (April, 1972), pp. 335-349.

Moore, Mack. "The Role of Temporary Help Service in the Clerical Labor Markets." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1963.

Morrison, Denton and Henkel, Ramon. The Significance Test Controversy. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.

Morse, Dean. The Theory of the Peripheral Worker. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.

Mott, Paul E.; Mann, Floyd; McLoughlin, Quinn and Warwick, Donald. Shift Work. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.

Moulton, Harold G. and Maurice Levan. The Thirty Hour Week. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1935.

Nelson, Gaylord. "The Private Sector Simply Can't Do It All." American Federationist. Vol. 78, No. 8 (August, 1971), pp. 26-28.

Newman, Dorothy. "The Decentralization of Jobs: Job Opportunities in the Suburbs Out of Reach of the Center-City Poor." Monthly Labor Review, May, 1967, (Vol. 90, No. 5), pp. 7-13.

New York Times, September 10, 1973; November 4, 1973; November 18, 1973; December 2, 1973.

Nixon, Russell. Legislative Dimensions of the New Careers Program: 1970. New York: Center for Social Policy and Program Development, Graduate School of Social Work, New York University, 1970.

__________ Remarks before the National Manpower Policy Task Force, *Conference on Upgrading and New Careers*, Washington, D.C., March 20, 1970, pp. 62-72.

Oppenheimer, Valerie K. *The Female Labor Force in the United States*. Berkeley: University of California, 1969.

Opton, Edward M. Jr. *Factors Associated with Employment Among Welfare Mothers*. Berkeley: Wright Institute, 1971.

Parsons, Talcott and Neil Smelser. *Economy and Society*. New York: The Free Press, 1956.

"Part-time Employment for Women with Family Responsibilities," Reports and Inquiries. *International Labor Review*, Vol. LXXD, No. 6 (June, 1957), pp. 543-553.

"Part-time Employment of Women in Great Britain." *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 54, No. 5 (May, 1942), pp. 1089-91.

Pearl, Arthur. "Focus: New Careers: One Solution to Poverty." *Poverty and Human Resources*, Vol. 2, No. 5 (September-October, 1967), pp. 23-24.

Perella, Vera. "Women and the Labor Force." *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 91, No. 2 (February, 1968), pp. 1-12.

Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, February 23, 1972; November 8, 1973.

Piore, Michael. "Income Maintenance and Labor Market Entry: The FAP Proposal and the AFDC Experience." *Poverty and Human Resources*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Mah-June, 1970), pp. 15-22.

Poor, Riva, ed. *4 Days, 40 Hours; Reporting a Revolution in Work and Leisure*. Cambridge: Bursk and Poor Publishing Company, 1970.

Rein, Martin. "Work Incentives and Welfare Reform." *Urban and Social Change Review*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Spring, 1972), pp. 54-58.

Rein, Mildred and Wishnow, Barbara. "Patterns of Work and Welfare in AFDC." Welfare in Review, Vol. 9, No. 6 (November-December, 1971), pp. 7-12.

Reubens, Beatrice. The Hard to Employ: The European Experience. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.

_________ "Noncompetitive Jobs and Welfare Reform." Manpower, Vol. 3, No. 9 (September, 1971), pp. 21-23.

Riessman, Frank. Strategies Against Poverty. New York: Random House, 1969.

_________ and Pearl, Arthur. New Careers for the Poor, Nonprofessionals in Human Service. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

_________ and Popper, Hermine I. (eds). Up From Poverty: New Career Ladders for Nonprofessionals. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Robertson, John. The Eight Hours Question. London: S. Sonnenschein and Company, Ltd., 1893.

Seear, N.B. Re-entry of Women to the Labour Market After an Interruption in Employment. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1971.

Shea, John; Parnes, Herbert, et al. Years for Decision, Vol. 1, Manpower Research Monograph No. 24. U.S. Department of Labor/Manpower Administration. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

Smith, Robert. An Analysis of Labor Market Adjustments in the Clerical Temporary Help Market 1953-60. Springfield, Virginia: National Technical Information Service, 1971.

Sobey, Francine. The Nonprofessional Revolution in Mental Health. New York: Columbia Press, 1970.

Soderland, Jens. Part-time Work Within Retail Trade. Stockholm: Personnel Administration Council, 1968.

Spinyarn, Natalie. "The Multiple Pay Offs of Paraprofessionalism." City, Vol. 5, No. 4 (Summer, 1971), pp. 40-44.

Stein, Robert. "Economic Status of Families Headed by Women." Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 93, No. 12 (December, 1970), pp. 3-9.

Thorsell, Siv. "Employer Attitudes Toward Female Employees," in The Changing Roles of Men and Women, Edmund Dahlstrom, ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), pp. 135-169.

"Towards an Optimum Pattern in Shift Work and Employment Expansion." International Labor Review, Vol. 98, No. 3 (September, 1968), pp. 245-274.

"Trade Union Conference on Shorter Hours of Work in the United States." International Labor Review, Vol. LXXV, No. 6 (June, 1957), pp. 554-565.

United Kingdom, Ministry of Labour and National Service, Planning for Part-time Work, (P.L. 105/1942).

United Nations Economic and Social Council, Commission on the Status of Women, 7th Session. "Part-time Employment, Preliminary Report," February 12, 1953.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Labor. Six-Hour Day--Five Day Week, Hearings, 72nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1933.

U.S. Congress. House. Ways and Means Committee. Social Security Amendments of 1967, House Report No. 544, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, 1968.

U.S. Congress. House. Ways and Means Committee. Social Security Amendments of 1971, 92nd Congress, 1st Session, 1971.

U.S. Congress. Joint Economic Committee, sub-committee on Fiscal Policy. Concepts in Welfare Program Design, Part I, (Paper No. 9, Studies in Public Welfare), 93rd Congress, 2nd Session, 1973.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Characteristics of the Population, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Detailed Characteristics of the Population, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Occupational Outlook Handbook, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968-69.

U.S. Department of Labor/Women's Bureau. Handbook on Women Workers, Bulletin 294. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

U.S. Department of Labor/Women's Bureau, Part-time Employment of Women in War Time, Special Bulletin No. 13, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1943.

U.S. Department of Labor/Women's Bureau. Part-time Work for Women, Bulletin 238. Washington, D.C.: 1960.

U.S. Department of Labor/Women's Bureau for the United Nations, Working Women and their Family Responsibilities: United States Experience, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

U.S. Department of Labor. The Work Incentive Program, First Annual Report to Congress on Training and Employment Under Title IV of the Social Security Act, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, June, 1970.

Van der Does de Willebois, J.L.J.M.. "A Work Shop for Married Women in Part-time Employment: Implications of an Experiment in the Netherlands." International Labor Review, Vol. 96, No. 6. (December, 1967), pp. 609-629.

Wall Street Journal. March 7, 1973.

Watson, Mrs. "The Part-time Worker." Industrial Welfare and Personnel Management, (May-June, 1948), as cited in United Nations Economic and Social Council, Commission on the Status of Women, 7th Session, "Part-time Employment, Preliminary Report," (February 12, 1953), p. 17.

White, Leslie. New Careers in Local Government. Berkeley Institute for Local Government, 1969.

Wiley, Wretha and Fine, Sidney. A Systems Approach to New Careers: Two Papers. Kalamazoo: Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1969.

Wilson, Michael. Job Development in the Public Service. Washington, D.C.: Social Development Corporation, 1971.

Women's Council (Landsorganisationen). Bulletin about Part-time Work. Sweden: mimeo, no date.

"Work as a Condition of Welfare." New York University Law Review, Vol. 44, No. 4 (October, 1969), pp. 775-803.